

**THE
EARLY PALLAVAS**

**Printed by
JITENDRA NATH DE
at the Sreekrishna Printing Works
259, Upper Chitpore Road, Calcutta.**

10

SYAMAPRASAD MOOKERJEE, Esq., M.A., B.L.,

BARRISTER-AT-LAW, M. L. C.,

*Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, with the
author's best regards.*

INTRODUCTION

The following pages may be regarded as a sort of supplement to my work entitled *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan* which has been published in the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 1-126, Calcutta University, 1935. The present treatise deals with the Pallavas who were for some time the supreme power in the Andhra country.

In placing this dissertation before scholars, I humbly invite their attention to the plan that I have adopted in preparing it. It will be seen that I have tried not to be led astray from the *terra firma* of solid facts by that eagerness for theorising which is so common among certain recent writers on the early history of the Pallavas.

My best thanks are due to Dr. H. C. Ray. Chaudhuri of the Calcutta University for his encouraging sympathy and for some valuable suggestions. I am also indebted to Dr. B. C. Law who has kindly published this monograph in his Research Series.

D. C. SIRCAR.

Calcutta University,
December, 1935.

CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
I. Early History of the Kāñcī Region	1
II. Rise of the Pallavas	8
III. Date of Śivaskandavarman	15
Appendix—Importance of the Aśvmedha	20
IV. Early Pallava Genealogy from Inscriptions of the Nellore-Guntur Region	24
V. Genealogy and Chronology of the Early Pallavas of Kāñcī ...	28
Appendix—The Vayalur List of Early Pallava Kings	33
VI. Śivaskandavarman and Skandavarman	35
VII. Chendalur Grant of Kumāra Viṣṇu II	42
VIII. Udayendiram Grant (No. 1) of Nandivarman	44
IX. Omgodu Grant (No. 1) of Skandavarman II	45
X. Crown-prince Viṣṇugopa and Dharma-mahārāja Siṃhavarman ...	47

CORRIGENDA.

PAGE	LINE	CORRECTION
1	9	Kāñci
3	15	possession of Gautamīputra
7	4	ed. 1924
12	15	the traditioal part
13	38	evidently is a corruption
22	15	<i>te rājan</i>
25	3	Viṣṇugopa
28	26	A. D. 436 or 437
31	22	497—537 A.D.

THE EARLY PALLAVAS

I

EARLY HISTORY OF THE KĀNCĪ REGION.

THE earliest reference to Kāñcīpura seems to be that in the *Mahābhāṣya* (iv, 2, second āhnikā) of the great grammarian Patañjali whose "date, B.C. 150, may now be relied upon" (*Bom. Gaz.*, I, ii, p. 140). Patañjali is now generally taken to have been a contemporary of the first Śuṅga king, Pusyamitra, who reigned from circa 185 to 149 B. C. according to Smith (*Ear. Hist. Ind.*, 4th ed., 208ff.). The mention of Kāñcīpura in the *Mahābhāṣya* goes to show that Kāñcī became a place of importance as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. It is however not certain whether Kāñcī was of political or commercial importance in the age of the *Mahābhāṣya*.

If traditions recorded by the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang are to be believed, Kāñcī rose to prominence even earlier than the age of the *Mahābhāṣya*. This Chinese pilgrim tells us that he noticed a *stūpa* about hundred feet high, built by king Aśoka in the city of Kāñcī (Beal, *Bud. Rec. Wes. Wor.*, II, p. 230). In this connection we may also note the mention of Aśoka or Aśokavarman as one of the early Pallava kings in the mythical portion of the later Pallava inscriptions. Hultzsch appears to be right in taking this Aśoka or Aśokavarman as "a modification of the ancient Maurya king Aśoka". The claim of having this great Maurya emperor as predecessor is to be found also in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, the traditional history of Kashmir (i, vv. 102-106). Though the genealogy of Aśoka given in the Kashmir chronicle does not tally with the Maurya genealogy found in the *Purāṇas*, the description of the Kashmir king named Aśoka "who had freed from sins and had embraced the doctrine of Jina (i.e. Buddha), covered Śuśkalettra and Vitastāra with numerous *stūpas*", clearly shows that he is no other than the great king of Pāṭaliputra. The inclusion of Maurya Aśoka in the traditional Pallava genealogy is therefore not impossible.

If however we take the find-spots of Aśokan inscriptions so far discovered in the far south as establishing the southernmost boundary of the Maurya empire in Aśoka's time, it would appear that the Kāñcī region lay outside that empire. Nevertheless, if traditions

recorded in early Tamil works are to be believed, the Maurya frontier at the time of Candragupta, grandfather of Aśoka, possibly extended far to the south of Kāñci. "We have seen that in the south the Maurya power, at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil hill in the Tinnevely District. In the time of Aśoka, the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennar river near Nellore, as the Tamil kingdoms are referred to as *prachamta* or border states and are clearly distinguished from the imperial dominions (*vijita* or *raja-viṣaya*) which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldrug District of Mysore" (Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 2nd ed., p. 195). If then the Kāñci region was once under the Mauryas, it may not be altogether impossible that owing to the commercial importance of its position Kāñci attracted the notice of a Maurya emperor or a viceroy of the southernmost Maurya province, who assigned this Sanskritised name to a Dravidian original like Kaccippeḍu¹.

The exhaustive list of countries, mentioned in Gautamī Balaśri's inscription, over which Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi is said to have ruled, does not mention any district of the far south. This fact along with the conspicuous absence of inscriptions and coins of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi in the Andhra region possibly goes to show that the country was outside the kingdom of this Śātavāhana king. It must however be noticed that Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi has been described in that famous Nasik Cave inscription as lord of the Vindhya, R̥kṣavat, Pāriyātra, Sahya, Kṛṣṇagiri (Kanheri), possibly Śrīśaila (*maca-siri-ṭana* = *Marīya śrī* or *Śrī-stana* ?), Mahendra, Malaya, Setagiri and Cakora mountains. Malaya and Mahendra, quite wellknown in Sanskrit literature, have been identified respectively with the Western Ghats (to the south of Nilgiri) and the Eastern Ghats. If there is in the list really the name of Śrīśaila, it is to be found in the Kurnool District of the Madras Presidency. Cakora has been mentioned along with Śrīśaila in the Pūranas. It is therefore possible that Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi claimed

of southern India. Since there is no mention of the

Gautamīputra's kingdom does not appear to be altogether correct. Another important point in this connection is the king's epithet *catuḥ-* (*catuḥ* = four) which says that his war-horses drank water from the four seas. The inscription does not refer to the conventional *catuḥ-* (*catuḥ* = four) but only to the *traya* (three seas) which evidently signifies the Western (Arabian Sea), the Bay of Bengal and the Southern sea (Indian Ocean). The

Maurya Candragupta and the southern expeditions of the Carukyas of Badami and Nalvati, of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed and later of Śivāji and Haidar Āli show that it was almost a custom with great Deccan kings to lead expeditions to the far south. Is it impossible that Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi's vague claim of

1. At the time of Aśoka, the southernmost Maurya province had its headquarters at Suvarṇagiri which has been identified by Hultzsch with Kanakagiri in the Nizam's dominions to the south of Maski (*Corp. Ins. Ind.*, I, p. xxxviii).

suzerainty over the whole of Southern India originated from such a southern expedition ?¹

The Amaravati inscription of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi (*A. S. S. I.*, I., p. 100 ; pl. LVI. no. 1), Amaravati inscription of Śivamaka Śāta (siri-Sivamaka-Sada ; *ibid.*, p. 61 pl. LVI, no. 2), Chinna inscription of Gautamīputra Yajña Śātakarṇi (*Ep. Ind.*, I, p., 95), Kodavali inscription of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Candra Śāti (Caḍa Śāta ; *ibid.*, XVIII. pp. 316 ff.) and the Myakadoni inscription of Pulumāvi (*ibid.*, XIV, p. 155) however clearly show that the successors of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi certainly ruled in the Andhra region. This southerly extension of the Śātavāhana power may have been due to the rise of the house of Caṣṭana who seems to have established himself at Ujjayinī and to have been a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy (c. 140 A. D.) and of the Śātavāhana king Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi, son of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi. We know from the Junagadh inscription (*ibid.*, VIII, pp. 44 ff.) that Caṣṭana's grandson Rudradāman (c. 130-150 A.D.), who for sometime ruled conjointly with his grandfather,² was reigning over some of the countries that were formerly under the possession Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi.

The occupation of the Andhradeśa and adjoining districts by the later Śātavāhanas is also proved by numismatic evidence. According to Rapson (*Cat. C. Brit. Mus.*, p. lxxi), the Śātavāhana coins found in the Kistna-Godavari region "fall into two classes distinguished from each other both by their type and their fabric." In the district of the first fabric, coins of the following five kings have been found (*ibid.*, lxxii) :

1. Vāsiṣṭhīputra śrī-Pulumāvi,
2. Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śivaśrī Śātakarṇi,
3. Vāsiṣṭhīputra śrī-Candra Śāti,
4. Gautamīputra śrī-Yajña Śātakarṇi, and
5. śrī-Rudra Śātakarṇi.

In the district of the second fabric are found coins struck by the following three kings (*ibid.*, p. lxxiv) :

1. śrī-Candra Śāti,
2. Gautamīputra śrī-Yajña Śātakarṇi, and
3. śrī-Rudra Śātakarṇi.

Some lead coins found in the Anantapur and Cuddapah Districts have been taken by Rapson to have belonged to some feudatories of the Śātavāhana kings (*ibid.*, p. lxxxi). This suggestion appears to be supported by the following facts. Firstly, in the

1. A Nasik inscription possibly refers to a southern expedition led by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi who seems to have once encamped at Vaijayanṭī. Vaijayanṭī which was later the capital of the Cuṭu Śātakarṇis and after them of the Kadambas has been identified with modern Banavāsi in the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency.

2. Raychaudhuri, *Op. cit.*, pp. 317 ff.

Chitaldrug District has been found a coin of one Sadakana (Śātakarṇi) Kaḷalāya Mahārāṭhi who was most probably a feudatory of the great Śātavāhanas ; secondly, the Myakadoni (Bellary District) inscription of Pulumāvi shows that the Bellary region was called the *janapada* (district) of Śātavāhanihāra and that it was under the rule of a governor (*mahāsenapati*) whose name was Skandanāga. This fact seems to show that the southern districts of the Śātavāhana kingdom were ruled by military chiefs.

From what has been said above it is perfectly clear that the dominions of the later Śātavāhanas extended as far as the borders of the district of Kāñci. We shall now consider the question whether Kāñci could have formed a part of the Śātavāhana kingdom.

There is no epigraphic evidence to prove that the Śātavāhana kings ruled over Kāñci ; but certain lead coins with "ship with two masts" on one side and the Ujjain symbol on the other have been discovered on the Coromandel coast between Madras and Cuddalore. "That they belong to the Andhra (Śātavāhana) dynasty seems certain from the Ujjain symbol which forms their reverse type, and from such traces as remain of the coin-legend. On the solitary specimen on which these traces admit of any probable restoration the inscr. appears to be intended for *Siri-Pu[ḷuma]visa* (no. 95, p. 22 ; pl. V)".¹ Of course, mere discovery of some coins of a certain dynasty in a certain area may not prove that that particular area was under the direct control of the rulers of that dynasty. But this distinct type of ship-coins found exclusively in the Coromandel coast possibly supports the view that at least the issuer (or issuers) of the ship-coins had some sort of political supremacy over the coast region. But who ruled the coast country during the time of the later Śātavāhanas who had most probably issued the ship-coins ?

"The coast-region in which these coins are found was at first ruled by the Cholas ; but before the middle of the 3rd century A. D. it was passed into the power of the Pallavas who were themselves in turn overthrown by the later Andhras (i. e., Śātavāhanas)."² This view however is not supported by the evidence of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*.

The name of Kāñcipura in the *Periplus* as this work does not attempt to give an exhaustive list of cities and towns of the countries about which it speaks. The Kāñci region was possibly not a separate political unit at the age of this work (c. 80 A. D). The *Periplus* says : "§ 59. From Komari (= mod. Kumārikā) towards the south (actually toward NNE) this region extends to Kolkhi (= Karkai on the Tāmrāpargi in the Tinnevely Dist. ; Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 469).....; and it belongs to the

1. Ibid., pp. lxxxi—ii

2. Ibid., p. lxxxii.

Pandian kingdom. Beyond Kolkhi there follows another district called the Coast country (= Coromandel or Cola-maṇḍala coast), which lies on a bay, and has a region inland called Argaru (= Uragapura = mod. Uraiyūr near Tanjore)..... §60. Among the market-towns of these countries and the harbours where the ships put in from Damirika and from the north, the most important are, in order as they lie, first Kamara, then Poduka, then Sopatma ; in which there are ships of the country coasting along the shore as far as Damirika ; and other very large made of single logs bound together called Sangara ; but those which make the voyage to Khryse and to the Ganges are called Kolandia and are very large." We do not definitely know whether any of these three ports mentioned by the *Periplus* belonged to the district of Kāñci ; but the fact that the *Periplus* after referring to the Coast country refers to Masalia (= District round Masulipatam) possibly suggests that the borders of the Coast country touched, in the age of the *Periplus*, those of the district round Masulipatam. This suggestion, it should be noticed, is in accord with the tradition which says that "the Chola country (Cholamaṇḍalam) was bounded on the north by the Pennar and on the south by the southern Vellaru river ; or, in other words, it extended along the eastern coast from Nellore to Pudukottai, where it abutted on the Pāṇḍya territory" (Smith, op. cit., p. 480).

In the *Geography* of Ptolemy (c. 140 A. D.) who gives a fairly exhaustive list of countries, cities and important places, we do not find the name of Kāñci ; but the district of Kāñci can be satisfactorily identified from Ptolemy's map of India. The order of the position of countries in the east coast has been thus given in Ptolemy's *Geography*, VIII, i :

1. Country of the Pandiones (= Pāṇḍyas) with its capital at Modoura (= Madurā) 125° 16' 20', ruled by Pandion (§ 89) ;
2. District of Batoi (§ 90) with its metropolis at Nisamma 125° 10' 10° 30' (§ 12) ;
3. Coast of the Soringoi (= Coḷas) with its capital at Orthoura 130° 16' 20', ruled by Sōrnagos (§ 91) ;
4. Arouarnoi with its capital at Malanga 130° 13', ruled by Basaronagos (§ 92) ; and
5. District of the Maisōloi (called Maisōlia in § 15) with its metropolis at Pitundra 135° 18' (§ 93).

It is clear from the situation of the above countries, that on the way from the district of Masulipatam to the Pāṇḍya country, i.e., to the south of the former, lay first the country of Arouarnoi, then the coast of the Soringoi, and then Batoi. This "coast of the Soringoi" is evidently the same as the "Coast country" of the *Periplus* which seems to represent the Cola-maṇḍala of Sanskrit literature. Its capital Orthoura appears therefore to be the same as Argaru of the *Periplus*, and Uraiyūr (= Uragapura) of the

present day¹. But what about this Arouarnoi which has not been mentioned in the *Periplus*, but has been placed between the Cola-maṇḍala and Masulipatam by Ptolemy? In this connection it is interesting to note what Prof. S. K. Aiyangar says about the countries of this coast. "The east coast region, however, beginning with the river Vellar flowing across the state of Pudukottah now and emptying itself into the Bay of Bengal which marked the orthodox southern boundary of the Cholas, constituted the Chola-maṇḍalam which actually extended northwards therefrom to as far as the river South Pennar where began the division known as Aruvānāḍu, which extended north-wards along the coast almost as far as the Northern Pennar" (Intro. to *Pallavas of Kanchi* by R. Gopalan, p. xi-ii). There can hardly be any doubt that this Aruvānāḍu between the Northern and Southern Pennars is the Arouarnoi of Ptolemy's *Geography*. This Arouarnoi is practically the same as the Kāñci-maṇḍala, i.e. the district round Kāñci. It must however be noticed that the capital of this district, in the time of Ptolemy, was at Malanga which appears from Ptolemy's map to have been far to the north of Kāñci.

It now appears that the Cola-maṇḍala or the Cola coast which at the time of the *Periplus* was possibly bounded by the Pāṇḍya country in the south and the Masuli district in the north was divided into two kingdoms in the age of Ptolemy (c. 140 A. D.). What is however more interesting is that in the time of the Greek Geographer, the Cola-maṇḍala proper was being ruled by a king named *Sōr-nāga*, while Aruvānāḍu, the northern part of the former Cola kingdom, was under the rule of a king named *Basaro-nāga*. We can not be definite whether these two names really represent Indian names like Sura-nāga (or Sūrya-nāga) and Vajra-nāga (or Varṣa-nāga); but there can be no doubt that in Ptolemy's time the Cola kingdom as well as the district round Kāñci was ruled by princes who belonged to the family of the Nāgas. The existence of the Nāgas in the Coromandel coast seems to be further supported by the existence of a city called *Nāga-pura* in the Cola country, and another of the same name in the Cola country.

Nāga-pura (or *Nāga-pura*) is mentioned by Ptolemy (Geog., vi, 16) as being ruled by a king named *Nāga*. It is however difficult to ascertain whether the *Nāga-pura* mentioned by Ptolemy is the same as the *Nāga-pura* (—Uragapura) mentioned by Kalidāsa (cf. *Uragapura* in *Uragapura* — *Uragapura*) was being ruled by the Nāgas. The name *Nāga-pura* is also mentioned by Ptolemy (Geog., vi, 16), nevertheless the name supports a conjecture that the Cola country in the heart of the Cola country was under the Nāgas.²

Argaru (125° 15' 14" 20' has been mentioned by Ptolemy (*Geog.*, vi, 16) as being ruled by a king named *Argaru*. It can however hardly be identical with *Argaru* (=Uragapura) mentioned by Kalidāsa. *Argaru* is placed in the Coast country beyond the kingdom of Pandion. Ptolemy's *Argaru* in the Pāṇḍya country is evidently the same as Uragapura mentioned by Kalidāsa as the capital of the Pāṇḍya country (cf. *Uragapura* in *Uragapura*). That Uragapura of these two Greek authors is different is also proved by the fact that while the *Periplus* has it as "a region inland called Argaru", Ptolemy's map places the city just on the sea-shore (Plates in *La Géographie de Ptolémée* par Renou, Paris, 1925).

2. It may alternatively be suggested that Uragapura is really a Sanskritised form of the Tamil name *Uraiūr* (literally, "city of greatness"?). We must however notice that as early as the beginning of the Christian era the locality (or localities) was known to foreigners not as *Uraiūr*, but as Uragapura (cf. *Argaru*).

In this connection we should also notice the Buddhist traditions of Ceylon and Siam which speak of a Nāga country on the coast near the "Diamond Sands," to the south of Dantapura, between the mouth of the Ganges and Ceylon (Cunningham, *Anc. Geog. Ind.*, ed. 1934, pp. 611-12). This country has been called Majerika. We do not know whether Majerika is the same as Masulika (Masulipatam) or a district named after the Manjhira branch of the Godavari, or it is Ptolemy's Arouarnoi where the Nāga king Basaro-nāga once ruled. But the traditions seem to support the existence of a Nāga country on the eastern coast. Much value of the traditions is however vitiated by the fact that the epochs to which the two traditions refer are irreconcilable. The Ceylonese tradition gives the date as B. C. 157, while the Siamese tradition gives A.D. 310-313. If we believe in the latter tradition (and also in the fact that the tradition refers to the Nāgas of the Coromandel coast), the Pallavas would appear to have risen to prominence after A. D. 313. This however seems to be improbable.

Before the middle of the second century therefore not the Pallavas but the Nāgas were ruling the coast country.

As scholars generally take Ptolemy's Siriptolemaios (siri-Pulumāvi), ruler of Baithāna (Paithan in the Aurangabad Dist.) to be the same as Vāsiṣṭhīputra śri-Pulumāvi, son of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, we see that Basaro-nāga, ruler of the Kāñci region, and Sōr-nāga, ruler of the Cola-maṇḍala, reigned contemporaneously with this Sātavāhana king who possibly was the first to establish the Sātavāhana power in the Andhra country (*Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 2nd ed., p. 313)¹. It may not be altogether impossible that the successors of Basaro-nāga acknowledged the suzerainty of the powerful successors of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi, such as the great Gautamīputra Yajña Śātakarṇi. It should be noticed here that Pulumāvi of the ship-coins appears to be the same as the king of the Myakadoni inscription, who was probably a successor of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi and was the last king of the direct Sātavāhana line.

1. Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi has been called "lord of the Dakṣiṇāpatha" in the Nasik inscription of year 19. In line 12 of the Junagadh inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, pp. 44 ff.), the Śaka king Rudradāman (c. 130-150 A.D.) mentions his Sātavāhana contemporary (Pulumāvi ?) as "Śātakarṇi, lord of the Dakṣiṇāpatha."

II

RISE OF THE PALLAVAS.

SCHOLARS are now generally of opinion that the Pallavas were not indigenous to the Kāñcī region. Thus Prof. S. K. Aiyanger says, "The Pallavas seem nevertheless to have been foreign to the locality as far as our evidence takes us at present" (*op. cit.*, p. x). The question is now : When did the Pallavas attain political supremacy in the Kāñcī region ?

We have already seen that about the middle of the second century A. D., when Ptolemy is known to have written his *Geography*, the above region was being ruled by the Nāgas. The Pallavas therefore could not have ruled as a recognised political power in the same locality before the middle of the second century of the Christian era. They are however believed to have risen to prominence certainly before the middle of the fourth century A. D. which is the time of Samudragupta's Allahabad pillar inscription. This record, as we all know, mentions a certain *kañceyaka* Viṣṇugopa with whom the Gupta king (c. 330-375 A. D.) came in conflict during his South Indian campaign. This "Viṣṇugopa, ruler of Kāñcī" has been unanimously taken to have belonged to the Pallava family.

To about the same period should be assigned the Mayidavolu (*Ep. Ind.*, VI, 84) and Hirahadagalli (*ibid.*, I, p. 2.) grants of the Pallava ruler Śivaskandavarman, and the British Museum grant (*ibid.*, VIII, p. 143) dated in the reign of a Pallava king

These grants are written in Prakrit and are unanimously epigraphic records of the Pallavas. There is

however difference of opinion regarding the date of these epigraphs. But, as we have seen, they appear to belong to the first half of the fourth century A. D. The Pallavas therefore seem to have attained political supremacy in

Kāñcī some time after the middle of the second but before the beginning of the fourth

The next question would be : Who were the Pallavas and how did they succeed in obtaining mastery over the Kāñcī region from the hands of the Nāgas ?

It is almost certain that the Pallavas originally were executive officers under the Śātavāhana kings¹. They were most probably in charge of the government of districts with titles like *Maharāṭhi* and *Mahasenapati*, i. e. governor. There is inscriptional evidence to prove that the Śātavāhana kings took their officers from the families of

1. Aiyanger, *Op. cit.*, p. xv ; Sewell, *Hist. Ins. S. Ind.*, s.v., C. 225 A.D.

the Guptas and Nāgas. A Nasik inscription mentions an officer named Śiva-gupta, and the Karle inscriptions refer to Gupta and Śivaskanda-Gupta (*Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd ed., p. 332). We have already seen that a Nāga chief named Skanda-nāga was ruling the Bellary District in the reign of Pulumāvi who was possibly the last Śātavāhana king of the main line. The Pallavas may have been officers like the Guptas and Nāgas.

But, who were the Pallavas? ¹ Were they identical with the people called Palhavas in inscriptions and literature? Some scholars are in favour of the identification. Their arguments may be summed up as follows. The Palhavas, i. e. the Parthians, are known from inscriptions and coins to have been ruling in North-Western India in the beginning of the Christian era. In the time of the *Periplus*, "Parthian princes [who] were constantly driving each other out", were occupying the valley of the Indus. This people possibly pushed a little down to the south when they came in conflict with the Śātavāhana king Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi who is called "subduer of the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas." Indeed, from the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman we learn that a Palhava governor named Suviśākha, son of Kulaipa, was ruling the district of Ānarta² and Surāṣṭra under that great Śaka king. If, as it seems to be, the territory of the Palhavas lay not far off from the Śātavāhana kingdom, if they really came in conflict with the Śātavāhanas at the time of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, if the Palhavas accepted offices in the government of neighbouring kings, and if the Śātavāhana government accepted services of persons belonging to the neighbouring tribes, there is nothing impossible in the suggestion that the Palhavas were employed by the Śātavāhana kings and eventually carved out a principality in the south of the Śātavāhana kingdom after the decline of the latter.

1. See H. Krishnasastri, *Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 246. "The origin of the Pallavas has been obscure. A suggestion has been thrown out by Mr. Venkayya that they may have been connected with the Palhavas, mentioned in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas and there classified as foreigners outside the pale of Aryan society (*A. Surv. Rep.* for 1916-17, p. 217 f.). It is true that here the Pallavas are so classed with the Śakas, Yavanas and other foreign tribes; nevertheless the possibility of their being a class that originated from an intermingling of the Brāhmaṇas with the indigenous Dravidian tribes is not altogether precluded. This presumption is confirmed partly by a curious statement made in the Rāyakoṭa copper plates (*above*, Vol. V, p. 52) that Aśvatthāman, the Brāhmaṇa founder of the race, married a Nāga woman and had by her a son called Skandaśishya. Other copper plates (e. g., *S. I. I.*, Vol. II, p. 353, vv. 16 & 17) which relate a similar story mention in the name of Skandaśishya the name of the eponymous king Pallava, after whom the family came to be called Pallava. Hence it appears almost probable that the Pallavas like the Kadambas of Banavāsi (*Dy. Kan. Dist.* p. 286 and fn. 2), the Nolambas of Mysore (*Rice's Mysore and Coorg from Ins.*, p. 55), the Matsyas of Oḍḍavāḍi (Oḍḍādi in the Vizagapatam district) and other similar dynasties were the products of Brāhmaṇa inter-connections with the Dravidian races, as the stories related of their origin indicate. The Pallavas are however referred to in an early Kadamba record of the 6th century A.D. as Kṣatriyas, and their earliest sovereigns are stated to have performed Vedic sacrifices like the Aryan kings of old."

2. Ānarta is the district round modern Dvārakā. In the Mahābhārata (XIV, 52. 59; 53. 1) the same place has been referred to both as Ānartapuri and Dvārakā.

We however think that there are some very strong grounds against the identification of the Pallavas with the people called Palhava (i. e., the Parthians). If the people who were called *Palhava* at the time of Gautamīputra Śātakaṃi and Rudradāman, that is to say, during the first half of the second century A. D., is the same as the Pallavas whom we find stationed at Kāñci at about the end of the third century, how are we to explain the fact that the latter have never been called *Palhava* either in the records of their own or in records and works that refer to them? It is improbable that within the short period of about 150 years a tribe had utterly forgotten its original name, so much so that not even for once did its members use that name in the whole course of their history, though Indian literature in all succeeding ages has recognised a tribe named *Palhava*, sometimes even side by side with *Pallava*.

Another important point in this connection is that in the Hirahadagalli grant the earliest known Pallava king, Śivaskandavarman, who appears to have ruled in the first quarter of the fourth century A. D., is reported to have performed the *Āśvamedha* sacrifice. There is no evidence that kings belonging to foreign dynasties or tribes like the Śaka, Kuṣaṇa, Gurjara, Hūṇa and others ever performed the Horse-sacrifice, even when they were Hinduised. It seems highly improbable that a foreigner would be very favourable to the obnoxious practices followed during the course of this sacrifice. Unless an immigrant tribe hopelessly forgets its self and imbibe utter orthodoxy of Hinduism, it seems impossible for its members to be able to expose their wives to such indelicate practices as are necessary in performing the Horse-sacrifice¹. The performance of this out-and-out Brahmanical sacrifice by the earliest known Pallava king seems to go against the theory of foreign origin of the Pallavas.

The next important point is that the family of the Pallavas is known even from the earliest records to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra². This Bhāradvāja gotra is not known to have descended from the gotra of any earlier dynasty that ruled in the Deccan. The *Sātavāhanas* of the main line, whose records the Pallavas

¹ I am indebted to the suggestion to Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri of the Calcutta University. For the details see *Śukla-Yajurveda*, XXII-XXV, with Mahīdhara's commentary thereon.

² 1. *Mantra* to be uttered by the queen of the performer of the sacrifice: *mā nayati kaś=cana / śasasty=śvakaḥ subhadrikāṃ* (Mahīdhara's commentary: *mad=agamane=śro=nyām=ādāya śayisyata=iti mayā* *gamyate*, and pronouncing another *mantra*, the queen sits (according to Mahīdhara, lies down) beside the sacrificial horse. Queen: *tā ubhau caturah pādah samprasārayāva*; Adhvaryu: *svarge loke proryasvāthūp*. After the Adhvaryu covers the bodies of the queen and the horse with a sheet of cloth, the queen says: *vṛṣā vāḥ retodhā reto dadhātu*, and then according to Mahīdhara: *mahiṣi svayam=ev=āśva-bīman=ākṛṣya sva-yonau sthāpayati*. See also *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, XIII, iv. 2 and *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan*, p. 111.

2. According to K. P. Jayaswal (*Hist. Ind.*, p. 182), "The Pallavas were a branch of the *Vakātakas*." The theory however is obviously untenable, as the former is known to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra, while the latter belonged to the Viṣṇuvṛddha gotra.

imitated in drawing theirs, did never specially mention their own gotra. The Viṇḥukaḍa Cuṭu-Śatakarnis however called themselves *Manavya-gotra-Hariti-putra*. This title was imitated by the Kadambas who succeeded the Cuṭu Śatakarnis in the Kuntala country. The Calukyas who appear to have originally been provincial governors under the early Kadambas, got the title in their turn along with the sovereignty of the Kanarese country. Since the Pallavas do not use metonymics like their predecessors and since their Bhāradvāja gotra cannot be reasonably proved to have been imitated from any preceding ruling dynasty of the Deccan, it seems possible that they were originally Brahmanical Hindus of the Bhāradvāja gotra and therefore belonged to Northern India¹.

Pāṇini (IV. 1. 117) seems to say that the Śuṅgas belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. From the Purāṇas we know that the Śuṅgas succeeded the Mauryas on the throne of Magadha, and the Mālavikāgnimitra informs us that a secondary capital of the Śuṅgas was at Vidiśā (mod. Bhilsa in the Jubbulpore District). Is it altogether impossible that the Pallavas really were a branch of the Śuṅgas of Vidiśā, who gradually pushed to the south, took services under the Śātavāhanas and eventually carved out a principality in the Kāñcī region²? The fact that the Pallavas never try to connect themselves with the solar and lunar dynasties, famous in Indian legends, at least seems to show that they belonged originally to a Brahman family of Northern India. If a Brahman family rises to royal dignity, it can hardly look back for past glory to the Sūrya and Candra *Vamśas* which were Kṣatriya dynasties. They can however claim connection with *Bhāradvāja* Droṇa, the great epic king of Northern Pañcāla, who was a Brahman by birth, but took the profession of the Kṣatriyas. Cf. the case of the Sena kings of Bengal, who refer to themselves in their inscriptions as *Brahma-kṣatriya*.

But, how did the Pallavas occupy the Kāñcī region which was once under the Nāgas? This question is difficult to answer, as we know nothing definitely about

1. The Purāṇic genealogy of the Pallavas, based of the name of their gotraṣi, does not appear to have been imitated. See Fleet, *Bom. Gaz.*, I, II, p. 342, note. "The Purāṇic genealogy of the Rāshtrakūṭas makes its first appearance in the Sāṅgli grant (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, p. 247). The pretended historical genealogy of the Western Gaṅgas may have been concocted a little earlier, but was more probably devised about A. D. 950 (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 169). The Cola Purāṇic genealogy is apparently first met with in the *Kaliṅgattu-Purāṇi* (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, p. 329) which was composed in the reign of the Eastern Chālukya king Kulottuṅga Chola-deva I, A. D. 1063-1112. And the Purāṇic genealogy of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara is first presented in a record of A. D. 1118-19 (*Id.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 165).—The Purāṇic genealogy of the Pallavas is the earliest such pedigree that has as yet come to light. And possibly the discovery of it in some ancient record set the later fashion which became so general."

2. It may be noted that the early Gaṅgas claimed to have belonged to the Kāṇvāyaṇa gotra. Thus they claim connection with the famous Kāṇvāyaṇa royal line that succeeded the Śuṅgas on the throne of Magadha. We however do not know whether the claim can be an imitation, nor do we know whether the family-name *Gaṅga* has anything to do with the famous North Indian river named Gaṅgā.

the Pallava kings who ruled before Śivaskandavarman, or his father whose name is as yet unknown¹. Indeed, later Pallava inscriptions, such as the Kasakudi plates of Nandivarman-Pallavamalla (*S. Ind. Ins.*, II, p. 342), the Velurpalaiyam plates of Nandivarman III (*ibid.*, p. 508) and the Vayalur pillar inscription of Rājasimha (*Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, p. 150), have mentioned the names of some early Pallava kings otherwise unknown and have traced the Pallava pedigree from Lord Brahman, through His descendants, Aṅgiras, Bṛhaspati, Śaṃyu, Bharadvāja, Droṇa, Aśvatthāman, Pallava and Aśoka (or Aśokavarman). There can be no question about the unhistoricity of this part of the genealogy. It is obviously fabricated on the basis of the name of the *gotrarṣi* of the Pallava family. We know that the Pallavas belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra which has the *pravaras*, Bhāradvāja Aṅgirasa and Bāṛhaspatya. Pallava is evidently the eponym, while Aśokavarman "can scarcely be considered a historical person, but appears to be a modification of the ancient Maurya king Aśoka."

It must be noted that the order and from of names mentioned after Aśokavarman in the mythological part of the Pallava genealogy are not uniform in the different inscriptions. Hultzsch therefore remarked on this part of the Kasakudi grant (*S. Ind. Ins.*, II, p. 343), "It must rather be concluded that, at the time of Nandivarman nothing was known of the predecessors of Siṃhavishṇu but the names of some of them, and that the order of their succession and their relation to each other and to the subsequent line of Siṃhavishṇu, were then entirely forgotten." This part of the Pallava genealogy may be compared with the mythical genealogy of the Calukyas about which Fleet says, "For the above account (*scil.* Calukya genealogy before Pulikeśin I), a certain amount of foundation may be derived from the fact that from the time of Pulikeśin II onwards, the Western Chālukyas were constantly at war with the Pallavas, who were their most dangerous foes, coupled with a tradition of the later Kadambas that their family was a certain Trinetra or Trilochana. But in the region of the legend, the whole is a jumble of vague legends and Purāṇic myths of no authority" (*op. cit.*, p. 442). It is therefore difficult to believe that the mythical part of the Pallava genealogy is much useful for the purpose of authentic history. Nevertheless, it is tempting to make a few suggestions.

The Velurpalaiyam inscription says that Virakūrca, son of Cūta-pallava obtained the insignia of royalty along with the hand of a Nāga princess (cf. *prahara* = *prahara* = *prahara* = *rāja-ciḥnam* = *akhilam*). We have seen above that the Nāgas were rulers of the Kāñci region before the rise of the Pallavas in that locality; it is therefore not impossible that Virakūrca married the heiress

1. According to Sewell (*Hist. Ins. S. Ind.*, p. 17), "Bappa", i.e. the father of Śivaskandavarman, was a name assumed by Jayavarman of the Kondamudi grant. This theory is untenable in view of the fact that Jayavarman belonged to the Bṛhatphalāyana gotra, but the Pallavas are known to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. See my note in *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, VIII, p. 105; also *Suc. Sat. East. Dec.*, p. 33n.

of the last Nāga king of Malanga and thus became the first Pallava king of the district round Kāñci.¹ Some very late inscriptions (of about the 11th century) mention a king named Trilocana as the earliest illustrious ancestor of the Pallavas. He is also called Trinetra, Trinayana, Mukkaṇṭi-Pallava and Mukkaṇṭi-Kāḍuvetti (Butterworth, *Nellore Inscriptions*, I, p. 389, II, p. 671 ; cf. *Ep. Ind.*, XI, p. 349). He is described as having, like Śiva, a third eye on the forehead and is believed by some scholars to have been a historical person who was the founder of the Telugu-Pallavas and who ruled over tracts of the Telugu country (*An. Rep. S. I. Ep.* 1916, p. 138 ; Iyenger, *History of the Tamils*, 364, 384). The historicity of this Trilocana-Pallava is impossible in view of the facts that a similar Trilocana is said to have been the progenitor of the Kadambas in some Kadamba inscriptions of about the same period (*Ep. Carn.*, VII. Sk. 236) and that all the early Pallava records deny the possibility of the existence of any such early king named Trilocana-Pallava. Many scholars have now discarded this Trilocana as purely mythical. "The name Trilocana seems to have passed from the Kadamba inscriptions of the west to the Pallava inscriptions of the east" (Moraes, *Kadamba-kula*, p. 8, note 1).

(ii). The name of the father of Virakūra who was possibly the first king of the family was Cūta-pallava. May *Pallava*, the name of the dynasty, have anything to do with the second syllable of the name of the first Pallava king's father ?²

(iii). A successor of Virakūra was Skandaśisya who came in conflict with a king named Satyasena (verse 7). Was this Satyasena in any way connected with the Pālakkaka Ugrasena of the Allahabad pillar inscription, who possibly ruled at Palakkaḍa (sometimes a seat of Pallava government) in the Nellore region ?

(iv). Another successor of Virakūra was Kumāraviṣṇu (verse 8) who is credited with the seizure of Kāñci (*grhṭa-kāñcinagara*). Does it mean that the Pallavas first ruled at Malanga, the Nāga capital, which possibly lay somewhere to the north of Kāñci

1. Many scholars think that the Cuṭu-Śātakarṇis of Kuntala were Nāgas and that the father-in-law of Pallava Virakūra belonged to the family of these Cuṭu-Nāgas. Since we have proved Nāga occupation of the Kāñci region just before the rise of the Pallavas, the above suggestion seems to be more plausible. Mr. Jayaswal (*Hist. Ind.*, p. 189) is inclined to identify the Nāga relations of the Pallavas with the Bhāraśivas (possibly Nāgas) of Central India. His arguments however are not convincing.

2. I have elsewhere suggested that the names *Kadamba* and *Pallava* are possibly of totemistic origin. Tree-names like *Kadamba*, of tribes and families, many of which are totemistic, are quite common in India. When, on the other hand, we find that a sept of the Mundas is called Chirko i.e. mushroom (Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, II, 1892, p. 103) and another is called Sewar i.e. moss (p. 108) and that a totemistic section of the Rautias is called Kharia i.e. blade of grass (p. 123), the possibility of *Pallava*, i.e. twig, having originally a totemistic significance in connection with the Pallavas may not appear altogether impossible. Risley (p. 47) mentions Pallab as a subcaste of the Gokāls of Bengal. This evidently is a corruption of the Sanskrit word *paḷlabha* meaning "cow-herd".

and that Kumāraviṣṇu was the first Pallava king to have his capital at Kāñci ?¹ Had the Colas, then, become again master of their country and occupied the Nāga territory as far as the city of Kāñci ?

(v). A successor of Kumāraviṣṇu was Buddhavarman, who is called submarine fire to the sea that was the Cola army (*cola-sainy-arṇava-vāḍav-agni*). Does it signify the continuation of the war with the Colas, which we have supposed to have begun in the reign of Kumāraviṣṇu ?

1. If this Kumāraviṣṇu is identical with Kumāraviṣṇu I of the Chendalur grant, the above suggestion is improbable. Kāñci became the capital of the Pallavas long before the time of Kumāraviṣṇu I. In that case *ṛhita Kāñci-nagara* would possibly mean recovering Kāñci from the temporary occupation of the Colas.

III

DATE OF ŚIVASKANDAVARMAN.

THE Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants of Śivaskandavarman and the British Museum grant dated in the reign of king *Vijaya*-Skandavarman are the earliest available records of the Pallavas. They are written in Prakrit, while the later epigraphs of the early Pallavas are in Sanskrit. We have already noticed that there is a controversy over the date of these records and, therefore, of the Pallava rulers named Śivaskandavarman and Skandavarman, to whom they belong. Fleet thought that these kings should be placed after the Pallava king Viṣṇugopa mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription (*Bom. Gaz.*, I, ii, 319). According to this scholar therefore the two Pallava kings reigned about the last quarter of the fourth century A. D. Prof. Dubreuil (*Anc. His. Dev.*, p. 70), on the other hand, assigns Śivaskandavarman, whom he identifies with *Vijaya*-Skandavarman, to about A. D. 250-275, i. e. about the third quarter of the third century. It is however now generally believed that the king or kings mentioned in the Prakrit grants of the Pallavas ruled before the time of Viṣṇugopa ruler of Kāñci, mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription (Krishnasastri, *Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 243 ; Jayaswal, *Hist. Ind.*, p. 181). Here I am going to show that Śivaskandavarman probably reigned in the first quarter of the fourth century and that *Vijaya*-Skandavarman of the British Museum grant was possibly a different king who seems to have reigned a little later than Śivaskandavarman.

Ptolemy who wrote his *Geography* about A. D. 140, mentions (VII, i, 63 and 82) Tiastēnes (= Caṣṭana) ruler of Ozêê (Ujjayinī) and Siritolemaios (= siri-Pulumāyi or 'māvi) ruler of Baithána (Paithan in the Aurangabad Dist.) as his contemporaries. The Andau inscriptions, issued in the joint-reign of Caṣṭana and his grandson Rudradāman' are dated in the year 52 which must be referred to the Śaka era and should correspond to A. D. 130 (Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 2nd ed., pp. 307 ff.). Caṣṭana's contemporary Pulumāvi who has been identified with Vāsiṣṭhīputra śrī Pulumāvi, son of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi (ibid., p. 313), must also have ruled about the same time.

According to the *Matsya-Purāṇa*, which is the only work that gives a fuller list of the Sātavāhana kings and seems therefore to be more authentic as regards Sātavāhana chronology than the other Purāṇas, the following Sātavāhana kings ruled after Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi (See Rapson, *Cat. C. Brit. Mus.*, p. lxvii).

1. Śivaśrī [Śātakarṇi]	7 years.
2. Śivaskanda Śātakarṇi	7 years.
3. Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi	29 years. ¹
4. Vijaya	6 years.
5. Caṇḍaśrī [Śātakarṇi]	10 years. ²
<hr/>	
	59 years.
6. Pulomā[vi]	7 years. ³
<hr/>	
	66 years.

The only inscription of Pulomā or Pulumāvi, the last king of the list, has been discovered at Myakadoni in the Bellary district (*Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 153). We therefore cannot be definite as regards his rule over the Andhradeśa proper. But the Amaravati inscriptions of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi and Sivamaka Sada (= Śivaskanda Śātakarṇi ?), the Chinna (Kistna Dist.) inscription of Yajña Śātakarṇi and the Kodavali (Godavari Dist.) inscription of Caḍa Sāta or Sāti (Caṇḍaśrī or Candraśrī Śātakarṇi) leave no doubt that at least the Śātavāhana kings of the list, who ruled before Pulumāvi of the Myakadoni grant, were rulers of the Andhra country (*A. S. S. I.*, Vol. I, pp. 61 and 100; *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 95; XVIII, p. 316). As Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi son of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi is known to have ruled in the second quarter of the second century, it appears that the Andhra country was under the Śātavāhana yoke at least up to the beginning of the third century A. D.

According to Kṛṣṇasastri (*Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, p. 318), the second year of Caḍa Sāta or Sāti is equivalent to A. D. 210. We may therefore date the reigns of the above kings as follows.

1. Śivaśrī Śātakarṇi	circa	A. D. 160—166.
2. Śivaskanda Śātakarṇi	"	" 167—173.
3. Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi	"	" 174—202.
4. Vijaya	"	" 203—208.
5. Caṇḍaśrī [Śātakarṇi]	"	" 209—218.

According to the *Purāṇa*, Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi ruled for twenty-eight

1. The real name of this king is Yajña Śātakarṇi (see my note in *J. R. A. S.*, July, 1934, p. 560; also *Sue. Sāt. East. Dec.*, p. 4n). The Chinna inscription is dated in his twenty-seventh year (*Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 95). The Puranic tradition ascribing a reign-period of twenty-nine years to him therefore seems to be true.

2. The real name of the Puranic Caṇḍaśrī appears to have been Caṇḍa (or Candra) Śātakarṇi. He is never called Candraśrī or Caṇḍaśrī in inscriptions and coins.

3. The Myakadoni inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 153) of Pulumāvi is dated in his eighth regnal year. He therefore appears to have ruled for more than seven years.

years. He therefore seems to have ruled from about A. D. 132 to 159.¹ This date, though approximate, corroborates the fact that Vāsiṣṭhiputra śrī-Pulumāvi was a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy who wrote his book about 140 A. D. and of the Śaka ruler Caṣṭana who is known to have reigned in A. D. 130.

The Ikṣvākus who succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the rule of the Kistna-Guntur region (i. e. the Andhra country)² must therefore have risen to prominence not before the time of Caṇḍa(śrī) Śātakarṇi. The sovereignty of the Ikṣvākus over the Andhradeśa thus appears to have begun from about the end of the first quarter of the third century A.D. Vāsiṣṭhiputra Cāntamūla I, the first known Ikṣvāku king, should be placed after the time of Caṇḍa(śrī). He could not have been a feudatory of the Sātavāhanas, as he is said to be a performer of the *Aśvamedha* and *Vājapeya* sacrifices. According to the *Śatapatha-Brahmana* (V, 1.1.13),³ the performance of the *Vājapeya* bestows on the performer a superior kind of kingship called *Samrajya*, while Kieth has rightly pointed out that the *Aśvamedha* "is an old and famous rite, which kings alone can bring, to increase their realms" (*Rel. Phil. Ved. Upaniṣ.*, p. 343). It is perfectly clear from statements contained in the *Baudhayana-Śrautasūtra* (XV, 1), the *Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra* (XX, i. 1, quoted in the *Śabdakalpadruma-Parīṣiṣṭa*, s. v.) and the *Taittiriya-Brahmana* (III, viii, 9 4; V, iv, 12. 3) that a feudatory ruler could never perform the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice.⁴

We do not know for how many years the Ikṣvāku king Vāsiṣṭhiputra Cāntamūla I ruled over the Andhra country. It is however known from the Jaggayyapetta records that his son, Virapurisadata, reigned at least up to his twentieth year, while according to

1. From a different point of view, Prof. Rapson has also come to practically the same conclusion. The last known date of Nahapāna, the records of whose reign, according to many scholars, are dated in the Śaka era, is Śaka 46 = 124 A. D.; his reign could not have extended much beyond that date. Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi's success over Nahapāna almost certainly took place in the eighteenth year of his reign (cf. Nasik Ins., Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 71; Karle Ins., ibid., VII, p. 64). The eighteenth year of Gautamīputra is therefore A. D. 124 or 124 + *x*. Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi thus seems to have ascended the throne in A. D. 106 or 106 + *x*. The latest inscriptional date of this king is year 24, which would correspond to A. D. 130 or 130 + *x*. His son Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi appears to have lost much of his territories to the Śaka ruler Rudradāman before Pulumāvi's 19th regnal year and before Śaka 52 (A.D. 150), which is the date of Rudradāman's Junagadh inscription. According to Rapson therefore the accession of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi took place in about A. D. (150—19 =) 131. See Rapson, *op. cit.*, pp. xxvi—ii, xxx, xxxvi-viii. The chronology we have proposed here would place Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi approximately in A. D. 132-159 and Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, who seems to have ruled for about 24 years, in A. D. 107-131.

2. The Ikṣvāku records have been discovered at Jaggayyapetta in the Nandigram taluka of the Kistna District (*Ind. Ant.*, XI, p. 257) and at Nagarjunikonda in the Palnad taluka of the Guntur District (*Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 1).

3. Cf. *rāja vai rājasyen = eṣṭā bhavati, samrāj = vājapeyen = āvaran hi rājyan, paray admrājyan*; *kāmāyeta vai rājā samrāj = bhavīṣun*, etc.

4. See Kieth, *Black Yajus*, pp. cxxii-iv; and my note in *Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 311; also *Suo. Sāt. East. Dec.*, pp. 107 ff. See moreover the Appendix below, pp. 20 ff., where the whole question has been discussed.

the Kottampalugu record, Ehuṣula Cāṁtamūla II, successor of Virapurisadata and the last known king of the dynasty, ruled at least up to his eleventh year. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that these three Ikṣvāku kings together ruled for about more than half a century. The end of the reign of Cāṁtamūla II thus appears to have fallen in the fourth quarter of the third century A. D.

According to the evidence of the Mayidavolu grant, dated in the reign of Śivaskandavarman's father, the Andhrāpatha (i. e. the Andhra country) with its headquarters at Dhamṇakaṭṭa (Dhānyakaṭṭaka) passed from the Ikṣvākus to the possession of the Pallavas. Pallava Śivaskandavarman, who was like Cāṁtamūla I a performer of the great Vājapeya and Aśvamedha sacrifices, was preceded in the suzerainty of the Andhrāpatha at least by his father who must have ruled the country after Ehuṣula Cāṁtamūla II. Śivaskandavarman therefore can hardly be placed earlier than A. D. 300. This view, moreover, can be confirmed by an altogether different line of argument.

There is a great linguistic difference between the grants of Pallava Śivaskandavarman and the records of the Ikṣvāku kings. Like the Sātavāhana grants and all other early Prakrit inscriptions, the Ikṣvāku records found at Jaggayyapetta and Nagarjunikonda express double-consonants by single letters. The Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants of Śivaskandavarman, on the other hand, express them, in many cases, by two letters. Though the grants of Śivaskandavarman are in Prakrit, the legend on the seals of both the grants are written in Sanskrit. The Hirahadagalli grant, moreover, ends in a *maṅḡala* which is also written in Sanskrit. This linguistic difference between the epigraphs of the known Ikṣvāku kings and those of Śivaskandavarman (one of whose grants is dated in the reign of his father) clearly points to the fact that there was an interval between the reign of the former and that of the latter. Consequently, Śivaskandavarman could not have ruled much earlier than the beginning of the fourth century A. D. He cannot however be placed later than *Kāñceyaka* Viṣṇugopa who came in conflict with Samudragupta about the middle of that century. We have elsewhere shown that Pallava Śivaskandavarman ruled earlier than Śālaṅkāyana Devavarman who was a predecessor of Śālaṅkāyana Hastivarman, the *Vaiṅgeyaka* contemporary of Samudragupta (see *Ind. Cult.*, I, pp 498 ff; also *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 212 and *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 37). He therefore appears to have reigned about the first quarter of the fourth century.

We have elsewhere shown that the word *vijaya*, in names like Vijaya-Skandavarman, is not an integral part of the name, but is a simple honorific.¹ The name of the Pallava king mentioned in the British Museum grant therefore is Skandavarman. Some scholars think that the word *śiva* in the name Śiva-Skandavarman, is also an honorific like *vijaya* in the other names and that the Pallava prince *śiva*-Skandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants is identical with king *vijaya*-Skandavarman of

1. *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 208; also *Suc. Sāt. East. Dec.*, pp. 54-55.

the British Museum grant. The absence of any king named Śivaskandavarman and the existence of many Skandavarman in the traditional list of early Pallava kings, and also the use of the word *śiva*, in the Kadamba inscriptions, as an honorific in names like *vijaya-śiva*-Māndhātṛvarman, *vijaya-śiva*-Mrgeśavarman and *vijaya-śiva*-Kṛṣṇavarman (II), are taken to be proofs in support of this theory. It must however be noticed that there is not even a single instance where the word *śiva* is singly used as an honorific. It may be argued that *śiva* in the names of Śivaskandavarman of the Banavasi inscription (Lüders, *List*, no. 1124) and Śivaskandavarman of the Malavalli inscription (*ibid.*, no. 1196) is only an honorific compounded with the names. These persons belonged to royal families. But Śivaskandagupta is the name of an ordinary person in the Karle inscription no. 19 (*ibid.*, no. 1105) and Śivaskandila (Śivaskandanāga ?) is that of an ordinary officer in a Nasik inscription of Pulumāvi (*ibid.*, no. 1124). Since honorifics are not known to have been used by ordinary persons, it is clear that Śivaskandavarman was certainly not an improper name in ancient India. The name of Śivaskanda Śātakarṇi in the Puranic list of the Andhra (Śātavāhana) kings, where no other king's name is mentioned with an honorific, is also in support of this suggestion. Since the traditional list of early Pallava kings is of very doubtful authority, we can hardly make out anything from the non-mention of Śivaskandavarman in it. The identification of Śivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants with Skandavarman of the British Museum grant is therefore extremely doubtful.

As the British Museum grant is also written in Prakrit, a linguistic consideration may be useful in ascertaining its date. This grant expresses double-consonants, in all cases, by two letters, and generally follows the spelling accepted in literary Prakrit. It has moreover the usual imprecatory verses in Sanskrit. There can therefore be hardly any doubt that the British Museum grant is later than the grants of Śivaskandavarman. Skandavarman seems to have been a successor (immediate successor ?) of Śivaskandavarman.

Such linguistic considerations have led us to believe that the Pallava kings of the Prakrit record; Śālaṅkāyana Devavarman of the Ellore grant, Kadamba Mayūraśarman of the Chandravalli inscription (*A.R., Mys. Arc. Surv.*, 1929, p. 50), the Kadamba king of the Malavalli record (*Ep. Carn.*, VII, Sk. no. 264), Viṇhukaḍa Śātakarṇi of another Malavalli record (*ib.*, no. 263)¹ and Brhatphalāyana Jayavarman of the Kondamudi grant² may all be placed roughly between about the beginning and the middle of the fourth century.³

1. Linguistic consideration seems to suggest that the Banavasi inscription (*Ind. Ant.*, XIV, p. 331) belonged to an earlier Viṇhukaḍa Śātakarṇi.

2. The difference in the palaeography between the Kondamudi plates and the seal attached to them may be taken to suggest that Jayavarman ruled a little earlier than the time suggested by the linguistic standard of the Kondamudi grant. The legend on the seal is however in Sanskrit; it therefore cannot be much earlier than 300 A.D.

3. My paper on the *Date of Pallava Śivaskandavarman* was first published in *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, pp. 297 ff; the question was previously discussed in my paper, *Date of Śālaṅkāyana Devavarman*, in *Ind. Cult.*, I, pp. 498 ff. see also *Suc. Sāt. East. Dec.*, p. 74 n.

APPENDIX

IMPORTANCE OF THE AŚVAMEDHA

IN a note in *Ind. Cult.*, I, pp. 114-115, it has been suggested that since Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukunḍin and Pravarasena I Vākātaka have been called simply *Maharaja* (not *Maharajadhiraja*) in the inscriptions, they are to be taken as petty feudatory chiefs even though they performed the Aśvamedha. In support of this theory, Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar says that "even a feudatory chieftain can perform a Horse-sacrifice" (*ibid.*, p. 115) and that the Aśvamedha "may or may not be preceded by a *dig-vijaya*" (p. 116). These theories however are not only against the evidence of the Śruti literature, but also go against the evidence of the inscriptions of these kings.

In inscriptions, Pravarasena I has been called *samrāt*^{*} which never signifies a subordinate chieftain (cf. *samrāt[jo] vākātakānām mahārāja-śrī-Pravarasenasya* etc. in the Balaghat plates, *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 270, 1.4; also the Chammak plates, *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, III, p. 235)¹. That Mādhavavarman I was not incapable of *dig-vijaya* is proved by a reference to his expedition for conquering the eastern countries in the Polamuru grant (*Journ. A. Hist. Res. Soc.*, VI, p. 17). *Mahārājādhirāja*, based on *rājātirāja* etc. of the Scytho-Kuṣānas was in early times not very often used in South India. The Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I who performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice ruled over the Kuntala country about the end of the 5th century A. D. In inscriptions, he is simply styled Dharma-*Mahārāja*—not Dharma-*Mahārājādhirāja* like Pallava Śivaskandavarman and others. The Devagiri grant (*Ind. Ant.*, VII, p. 34) however calls him *ek-ūtapatra*, "possessor of the sole umbrella", which, as scholars have suggested (Moraes, *Kadambakula*, p. 39n), "is indicative of universal sovereignty". The Birur grant (*Ep. Carn.*, VI, p. 91) moreover calls him *dakṣiṇāpatha-vasumatī-vasupati*, "lord of the riches of the land of Dakṣiṇāpatha", which "clearly shows that Kṛṣṇavarman I claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan". See my paper on *Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman I* in *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, XVI, pp. 160 ff.

1. A critic of my views has tried to explain the passage *samrāt[jo] vākātakānām* as "mere overlord of the Vākātakas" (*Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 735). There is however a number of instances (e.g. in the early Pallava and Kadamba grants) which prove beyond doubt that *vākātakānām* here means "of (i.e. belonging to) the Vākātaka family." Another critic takes (*ibid.*, II, pp. 54-55) *samrāt-vākātakānām* to be one word in composition and points out that the passage has been used only in connection with the name of Pravarasena I which fact, he thinks, shows that the Vākātakas lost their original imperial position after the time of that king. This interpretation however supports our view that Pravarasena I Vākātaka was a *samrāt*. The Dudia plates (*Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 260 & n. 7), it should be noted, read *samrāṭaḥ* which, according to Kielhorn, is apparently a mistake for *samrājāḥ*.

Keith has pointed out that the Aśvamedha "is an old and famous rite, which kings alone can bring, to increase their realms" (*Rel. Phil. Ved. Upaniṣ.*, p. 343). The *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (XV, 1) says that a king victorious and of all the land should perform this sacrifice. According to the *Taittīriya Br.* (III, 8, 9, 4), "he is poured aside who being weak offers the Aśvamedha", and again (V, 4, 12.3), "it is essentially, like the fire offering, an *utsunna-yajña*, a sacrifice of great extent and elaboration". See Keith, *Black Yajus*, pp. cxxxii-iv. According to the *Āpastamba Śrauta S.* (XX, 1.1)¹, a universal (*sārvabhauma*) king can perform the Aśvamedha, but not (*n=api*)² an un-universal (*asārvabhauma*) king. It is clear from these statements that a subordinate ruler could never celebrate the Aśvamedha. A performer of the Aśvamedha may not have been a ruler of the earth from the North Pole to the South Pole or of India from the Himālaya to the Kumārikā; but he must have been an independent ruler of a considerable portion of India.

An essential feature of the Aśvamedha, besides the actual slaying of the horse, is that about the completion of the performance, at the bidding of the Adhvaryu "a lute-player, a Rājanya, sings to the lute three Gāthās, verses, made by himself which refer to victories in battle connected with the sacrifice" (Keith, *Rel. Phil. Ved. Upaniṣ.*, p. 344). Further, "As revealed in the later texts, the sacrifice is essentially one of princely greatness. The steed for a year roams under guardianship of a hundred princes, a hundred nobles with swords, a hundred sons of heralds and charioteers bearing quivers and arrows, and a hundred sons of attendants and charioteers bearing staves" (*Śat. Br.*, XIII, 4, 2, 5; *Baudh. Śr. S.*, XV, 1). See *Black Yajus*, loc. cit. To manage these requirements is simply impossible for a subordinate chief.

Moreover, that the progress of the Aśvamedha was sometimes impeded when other kings challenged one's authority to perform the sacrifice, is not only proved from the early cases referred to in *Śat. Br.* (XIII, 5, 3, 21-22) and *Mahābh.* (XIV, 74-84), but is also proved by a tradition recorded in such a late work as Kālidāsa's *Malavikāgnimitra* (Act V). It is stated that Puṣyamitra Śuṅga's sacrificial horse was let loose to roam for a year at its own will under the guardianship of his grandson Vasumitra who was attended by a hundred princes and brought the horse back after defeating the Yavanas as the horse perchance reached the southern bank of the Sindhu and was captured by the Yavana horsemen. That the Aśvamedha could not be performed without some sort of *dig-vijaya* is further conclusively proved by an eighth century

1. See *Śabdakalpādruma-pariśiṣṭa* (Hitabadi Office, Calcutta), s. v. *Aśvamedha*.

2. In place of *n=api* there is an alternate reading *api*, which is a later interpolation according to Keith (*Black Yajus*, p. cxxxii). The interpolation seems to show that *asārvabhauma* (=not master of all the land) kings could also perform the Aśvamedha. The word *asārvabhauma* however never means a feudatory. The alternate reading only shows that in later times kings who were powerful but who did not claim to be ruler of the earth (i. e. the major portion of the country) did also perform the Aśvamedha. It must however be noticed that the alternate reading goes against *all the old* texts quoted above.

inscription of the Pallavas. The Udayendiram grant no. 2 (*Ind. Ant.*, VIII, p. 273) records that Udayacandra, general of Nandivarma-Pallavamalla defeated the Niṣāda king Prthivivāghra *who was accompanying the Aśvamedha-turaṅgama* i. e. horse let loose in connection with a horse-sacrifice. This instance proves beyond doubt that the essential features of the Aśvamedha hardly changed even as late as the 8th century A. D. The famous poet Bhavabhūti who flourished in the same century also recognises the above characteristic when he refers to the sacrifice as *aśvamedha iti viśvajaṣṭinām kṣatriyaṇam = urjasvalaḥ sarva-kṣatriya-paribhūvī mahān = ulkarṣa-niṣkarṣuḥ* (*Uttaracarita*, Act IV).¹

Prof. Bhandarkar thinks (*Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 116) that the number of performance of the Aśvamedha could be increased by simply multiplying the amount of *dakṣiṇā* payable to the Brāhmaṇas. This view is however based on a wrong interpretation of the following verse of the Mahābhā. (XIV, 88. 14):

evam = atra mahārāja dakṣiṇām tri-guṇām kuru |
tritrāṇaṁ vrajatu te rājān brāhmaṇā hy = atra kṛāṇam ||

The verse obviously implies that, according to a Brahmanical theory, the *merit* accruing from the celebration of the Aśvamedha and not the Aśvamedha itself could be tripled if the performer offered three-fold *dakṣiṇā* to the Brahmanas.²

In *Ind. Cult.*, II, pp. 140-141, Mr. J. C. Ghosh has quoted the *Harivaṃśa* to show that feudatory rulers could also perform the Aśvamedha. Vasudeva, father of Kṛṣṇa, lived in Gokula on Mount Govardhana in the vicinity of Mathurā; he was engaged in cattle-rearing and was a *kara-dūyaka* to Kāṁsa, the king of Mathurā (*Harivaṃśa*, LVI, 1162-61). After the fall of Kāṁsa, the family of Vasudeva removed to Dvārakā. In Kṛṣṇa's conversation with Indra there is an incidental reference which says that while in Dvārakā Vasudeva performed an Aśvamedha (*ibid.*, CL, 8574).³ It will be seen that Mr. Ghosh's contention is clearly beside the mark. The question at issue is whether Vasudeva was a feudatory of the Mathurā kings *at the time of celebrating* the sacrifice after he was established in Dvārakā. There is absolutely no proof to show that he was. We do not know whether the Dvāraka region ever submitted to the kings of Mathurā. It must also be noted that the evidence of traditions recorded in works like the *Harivaṃśa* should always be taken with a grain of salt. *Harivaṃśa* is obviously written for the exaltation and glorification of the family (*vaṃśa*) of Hari

1. I am indebted for this and for some other references to Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri. That the Aśvamedha did not lose its original and essential significance in later times is also proved by the Vaidyanath Temple inscription which refers to Ādityasena as *śāstā samudr-āntar = vasundharāyā yaḥ = aśvamedh = ādya-mahakṛātānām*.

2. Another supporter of Prof. Bhandarkar's theory says (*Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 637 n), "The Aśvamedha certainly had a great imperial significance in the old days. But in the period under review it must have lost that importance. Otherwise it would not have been repeated so often." It may however be pointed out that the Aśvamedha is known to "have been repeated" many times even "in the old days." cf. e. g. Bharata Daṣyaṇti's 139 Aśvamedhas in *Sat. Br.*, XIII, 3.5.11; also *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 40 and *Suc. Sāt. East. Dec.*, p. 109.

3. Bangabāsi Ed., Viṣṇuparva, 91, 24.

(i.e. Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva) and like similar treatises in honour of other religious heroes is not free from extravaganzas incident to a pronounced theological bias. The critical historian can hardly hope for sober history in such texts. On the contrary the probability is that the parent of the hero of the tale has been given more than his due. In the *New Testament* the saviour of the Christians is described as the son not of a mortal man but of God, and in the *Saundarananda* (II, vv. 32, 39 etc.) etc. glories of the mightiest rulers are put on the head of a petty Śākya chief named Śuddhodana.

Mr. Ghosh moreover does not appear to take the evidence of the *Harivaṃśa* as a whole. While describing the Aśvamedha that was attempted by Janamejaya, *Harivaṃśa* itself (Baṅgabāsi Ed., Bhaviṣyaparva, II) makes it clear that the horse-sacrifice could not be celebrated by a petty chief. When the *Sarpa-yajñ* was finished, Janamejaya collected materials for the celebration of an Aśvamedha. Then he invited the *ṛtviks*, *purohitas* and *ācāryas* and said, "I am desirous of celebrating a horse-sacrifice. Do ye dedicate the horse" (verses 5 & 6).¹ Knowing however that the king's sacrifice would not be successful, the omniscient Vyāsa warned him not to begin the Aśvamedha. The sage said, "The Śruti lays down that the Kṣatriyas should celebrate the *Aśvamedha* the foremost of sacrifices. On account of the greatness of it, Vāsava will violate your sacrifice (verse 28).² "O slayer of enemies," the sage added, "as long as the world will last, the Kṣatriyas will not be able to collect materials for your horse-sacrifice" (v. 35).³ The king became very sad and said, "Console me by saying that the Aśvamedha will again be undertaken by kings" (v. 58).⁴ To this Vyāsa replied, "As energy counteracted by another lives in it, so (the knowledge of) the Aśvamedha, although stopped, will exist in the gods and Brāhmaṇas. There will be one Senānī,⁵ an *Audbhijja*, a *Dviṣa* and a descendant of Kaśyapa, who will revive the Aśvamedha in the Kali age (v. 39-40).⁶ Could this great sacrifice, of which the *Harivaṃśa* speaks in so high terms, be performed by a petty feudatory chief?

1. *Yakṣye'haṃ vājimedhena hayaṃ=utsṛjyātām=iti.*

2. *Aśvamedhaḥ kratuḥreṣṭhaḥ kṣatriyānāṃ parisrutaḥ, tena bhūvena te yajñam vāsavo dharṣayisyati.*

That the Aśvamedha could be performed only by the great kings is also proved by the fact that Vāsava (= Indra) is always represented as jealous of its performance. The *Harivaṃśa* describes how he endeavoured to spoil the Aśvamedha of Janamejaya (Bhaviṣyaparva, 5). Note also what Viśvāvasu says to the king, "O king, thou hast celebrated three hundred sacrifices; Vāsava therefore cannot forgive thee any longer" (*tri-yajñāḥ śata-yajvānam vāsavaḥ=tvāṃ na mṛṣyate, ibid., 5. 24*). In this connection note what Prof. Bhandarkar himself says in another occasion (*E. I., XIX, App., p. 2, n. 5*), "As Indra is represented as being suspicious of Govinda Gupta's power, the latter seems to have been a supreme ruler."

3. *Tvayā vṛttam kratuṃ=c=aiṣa vājimedham parantapa, kṣatriyā n=āhariḥyanti yñvad=bhūmir=dharisyati.*

4. *Yady=astī punar=āvṛttir=yajñasy=āśvāsayaśva māṇ.*

5. The reference is possibly to Puṣyamitra Śuṅga.

6. *Upātta-yajñō deveṣu brāhmaṇeṣ=upapatsyate, tejasū vyāhṛtaṃ tejas=tejas=ev=āvatiṣṭhate; audbhijjō bhavitā kaś=cit senānī kāśyapo dviṣa, aśvamedham kaliyuge punaḥ pratyūhariḥyati.*

IV

EARLY PALLAVA GENEALOGY FROM INSCRIPTIONS OF THE NELLORE-GUNTUR REGION.

SOME Sanskrit records of the Early Pallavas have been found in the Nellore and Guntur districts, which at one time formed the Northern part of the kingdom of Kāñci. The Pallava genealogy constructed from these records cannot be quite easily and satisfactorily assimilated into the traditional list of early Pallava kings found in later records. The Pallava kings mentioned in these northern inscriptions, moreover, can scarcely be identified without difficulty with the Pallava princes mentioned in the inscriptions of the rulers of Kāñci. It is therefore convenient to discuss the Early Pallavas of the northern records separately.

The Omgodu grant, no. 1 (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, 246), issued from the *sthāna* or city of Tambrāpa in the 33rd year of king Skandavarman, furnishes us with the following list of kings :

1. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu ; his son
2. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I) ; his son
3. Viravarman ; his son
4. Mahārāja *śrī-vijaya*-Skandavarman (II).

Next we come to the Uruvupalli grant (*Ind. Ant.*, V, p. 50) of prince Viṣṇugopavarman, issued from the *sthāna* of Palakkaḍa, in the 11th year of Mahārāja Siṃhavarman. Here we get the following names :

1. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I) ; his son
2. Mahārāja Viravarman ; his son
3. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II) ; his son
4. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman.

There can be no doubt that prince Viṣṇugopavarman, issuer of the Uruvupalli grant, was the son of king Skandavarman II who issued the Omgodu grant no. 1. There is however difference of opinion as regards the identification of king Siṃhavarman in whose reign the grant of the prince was issued. According to Fleet, Mahārāja Siṃhavarman was possibly an elder brother of the Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa. According to Hultzsch however king Siṃhavarman of the Uruvupalli grant is the same as Viṣṇugopa's son Siṃhavarman who issued the Omgodu (no. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants. "The term *Yuvarāja* or *Yuvamaharāja* which is prefixed to Viṣṇugopa not only in his Uruvupalli grant, but in the two grants of his son

Siṃhavarman, suggests that he never ascended the throne, but that the succession passed from his father Skandavarman II to his son Siṃhavarman. The reason of this need not have been premature death. If it is assumed that Viṣṇugopa declined to take up the reins of government or was prevented from doing so by some other reason unknown he may well have been alive during the reign of his son Siṃhavarman to whose eleventh year I would assign—*lāghavūt* as an Indian philosopher will say—the Uruvupalli grant" (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII. pp. 160-16).

Three inscriptions of Viṣṇugopa's son Siṃhavarman have as yet been discovered. They are the Omgodu (no. 2) grant issued in his fourth year from a *viṣaya-skandhāvāra* (*Ep. Ind.*, XV. 246), the Pikira grant issued in his fifth year from the *viṣaya-skandhāvāra* of the Memātura-vāsaka (*ibid.*, VIII, pp. 159 ff.) and the Mangalur grant issued in his eighth year from Daśanapura (*Ind. Ant.*, V, 154). They give us the following genealogical list :

1. Mahārāja Viravarman ; his son
2. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II) ; his son
3. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa ; his son
4. Dharma-mahārāja¹ Siṃhavarman

Next we come to the fragmentary Darsi record (*Ep. Ind.* I, p. 397). The only information we get from this inscription is that it was issued from the *athisthana* (city) of Daśanapura by the great-grandson of a Pallava king named Virakorcavarman. The form *virakorca* (cf. Virakūrcavarman of later grants) shows considerable Prakrit influence which proves that the grant belongs to the period immediately following the age of the Prakrit grants. We have already noticed that the Prakrit records of the Pallavas are not written in the early inscriptional Prakrit and that they have in them passages and verses couched in Sanskrit. It must also be noticed that the Omgodu grant (no. 1) of king Skandavarman II is dated in his 33rd regnal year, *on the 18th tithi of the third fortnight of Hemanta*. This is an old form of dating used in almost all Prakrit inscriptions. Like the Darsi grant, therefore, the Omgodu grant (no. 1) also seems to have belonged to the same period, i. e. the early Sanskrit period. Sanskrit grants showing considerable Prakrit influence appear to me not much later than the beginning of the fifth century A. D. They may be roughly placed between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century.²

1. Other South Indian kings (e. g. the Kadamba kings Mṛgeśavarman and Ravivarman) also used the title *Dharmamahārāja*. According to Fleet (*Bom. Gaz.*, I, ii. p. 288, note 5), the title means "a Mahārāja by, or in respect of, religion," and may be rendered by "a pious or riteous Mahārāja"; but what it actually denotes is "a Mahārāja who, at the particular time of the record, was engaged in an act of religion (*dharma*)."
Some kings are called *Dharmamahārājādhirāja*. Cf. Pallava Śivaskandavarman ; Gaṅga Nitimārga-Koṅṅuṇivarman-Permanaḍi and his successors (*op. cit.*, p. 303, note 3). The epithet *Dharma-mahārāja*, as Dr. Raychaudhuri suggests to me, seems to have been connected with the peculiar boast of these kings to be *Kaliyuga-doḍa-śeṣanna-dharm-oddharaṇa-nitya-sannaddha*.

2. For two such dates expressed in the old fashion in the Kadamba grants, see *below*.

It is possible that the great-grandson of Virakorcavarman, who issued the Darsi grant, was a predecessor of king Skandavarman II. Consequently, Virakorcavarman, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Darsi grant, was probably a predecessor of Kumāra-viṣṇu, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Omgodu grant (no. 1).

We have now to consider the seventh and last of the Sanskrit grants so far discovered in the Nellore-Guntur region. It is the Narasaopet record (commonly called the Chura grant), issued from the camp at Pālotkaṭa (= Palakkaṭa) during the reign of vijaya-Viṣṇugopavarman (II), son of Siṃhavarman, grandson of *Mahārāja* Viṣṇugopavarman (I) and great-grandson of Kandavarman (i. e. Skandavarman). See *An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep.* 1914, pp. 10 & 82. The grant is not dated; its language is Sanskrit and the alphabet used is Telugu. It registers the king's grant of the village of Curā in the Karmarāṣṭra to a Brahman named Casamiśarman who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra and was an inhabitant of Kuṇḍur.¹

The fact that the first three names of the Narasaopet list viz. (1) Kandavarman (i. e. Skandavarman), (2) Viṣṇugopavarman (I) and (3) Siṃhavarman, are found exactly in the same order in the Omgodu (no. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants of Siṃhavarman makes it almost certain that Viṣṇugopavarman II of the Narasaopet grant was a son and successor of the issuer of the above three grants. Two points however have been advanced (*ibid*, p. 82) against the possibility of this identification. First, it has been said that the characters in which the Narasaopet record is engraved are comparatively more modern than those used in the grants of Siṃhavarman. Secondly, it is argued that in the Uruvupalli, Omgodu (no 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants, the son of Skandavarman and father of Siṃhavarman has been mentioned as a Yuvarāja or Yuva-mahārāja, while in the Narasaopet grant Viṣṇugopavarman I is called *Mahārāja*. It has therefore been observed that Viṣṇugopavarman II of the Narasaopet grant "must be a later king and very probably one of the missing group immediately preceding the line of Siṃhavarman and Siṃhaviṣṇu whose history is pretty certain" (*loc. cit.*). The grant has been assigned to the beginning of the 7th century A. D.

In connection with the first point however we should notice the fact that the characters used in the Omgodu grant (no. 2) of Siṃhavarman, son of Viṣṇugopavarman (I), are remarkably similar to those of the Narasaopet grant of Viṣṇugopavarman II. Kṛishnasastri therefore thought that the Omgodu grant (no. 2) "must have been a copy of a grant of the 5th-6th century A. D., put into writing in the 7th century, though no direct evidence, external or internal, is to be found on this point from the wording of the grant itself. The numerous mistakes made by the engraver may possibly point to this conclusion" (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 252). If the Omgodu grant (no. 2) is believed to have been an early record copied about the beginning of the 7th century A. D., what

1. The same as the native village of Śivaśarman, recipient of the Polamuru grant of Viṣṇugopavarman I. See *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 959 and *Soc. Sci. East. Dec.*, p. 93.

is the objection if we think that the Narasaopet grant was also an early inscription likewise copied about the same time ?

As for the second point, it may be said that the epithet Mahārāja applied to Viṣṇugopavarman I in the Narasaopet grant, which should properly be Yuvamahārāja is a mistake due to the engraver's inattention. The possibility of such a mistake becomes greater, if we believe that the Narasaopet record is an early grant copied years after, like the Omgodu grant no. 2, about the beginning of the 7th century A. D.

From the seven Sanskrit copper-plate grants, therefore, the following genealogical list of the Early Pallava kings may be prepared :

1. Mahārāja Virakorcavarman (Darsi grant) ; his successor
2. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu ; his son
3. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I) ; his son
4. Mahārāja Viravarman ; his son
5. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II) ; issued the Omgodu grant no. 1 in his 33rd year ; his son

5A. Mahārāja Siṃhavarman (I ?) ; he is according to Fleet the Pallava king referred to in the Uruvupalli grant ; his existence however is doubtful ;

5B. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman (I) ; issued the Uruvupali grant ; did not rule as Mahārāja ; seems to have been wrongly called Mahārāja in the Narasaopet grant ; his son

6. Mahārāja Siṃhavarman (II ?) ; issued the Omgodu no. 2, Pikira and Mangalur grants respectively in his 4th, 5th and 8th years ; his son
7. Mahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman (II) ; issued the Narasaopet grant.

V.

GENEALOGY AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE EARLY PALLAVAS OF KĀŅCI.

WE do not know whether the Pallava kings discussed in the last section ruled over the whole of the kingdom of Kāñci. It is however probable that some one of the princes of the Pallava house of Kāñci, who was originally made a viceroy of the northern part of the Pallava kingdom by the king of Kāñci, carved out a separate principality in that part, independent of his overlord. If this suggestion is to be believed, the kings of the main line of the Pallavas appear to have been ruling at Kāñci side by side with the branch line that was ruling in the northern part of the old kingdom of Kāñci. Here we shall try to see what we know about the history of Kāñci after the time of the Pallava kings of the Prakrit grants.

We have seen that Kāñci was under a Pallava king about the fourth quarter of the third century A. D. That king was succeeded by his son Śivaskandavarman who ruled about the first quarter of the fourth century A. D. He was possibly succeeded by a king named Skandavarman. In the British Museum grant of the time of this king, there is mention of the Pallava Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman and of the Yuvamahārāja's son whose name has been doubtfully read as Buddhyaṅkura. It is not known whether this crown-prince Buddhavarman and his son ever ascended the Pallava throne of Kāñci.

In an attempt to fix the date of the early Pallava kings of Kāñci, we are fortunate to have at least three points whereon we can stand with confidence.

(i) The first of these points is supplied by the Jain work, *Lokavibhāga* (*Rep. Mys. Arch. Dep.*, 1909 & 1910), where the precise date of the completion of the work is given as the 22nd year of Siṃhavarman, lord of the Pallavas, and as 80 beyond 300 years of the Śaka era. The 22nd year of a Pallava king named Siṃhavarman therefore comes to be equivalent to Śaka 380, i.e. A. D. 458. According to S. Jha the date given in the *Lokavibhāga* corresponds to the 1st of March, 458; but according to Fleet to the 25th of August, 458. Any way, the 22nd year of the Pallava king Siṃhavarman corresponds to A. D. 458. He therefore began to reign in (458—22 =) A. D. 436 (*Ep. Ind.*, XIV. p. 334).

(ii) The second point of importance is furnished by the Penukonda plates of the Gaṅga king Mādhava (*ibid.*, 331ff.) which, according to Fleet, are to be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to about A. D. 475. It may be noticed here that the characters of this epigraph are remarkably similar to that of the epigraphs of the Śaṅkāyana king

Nandivarman II (e.g. the Peddavegi grant ; *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, I. 92ff) whom I have placed about the middle of the fifth century A. D. (*Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, 208ff and *Suc. Sāt. East. Dec.*, p. 62.). The Penukonda grant was issued by the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Siṃhavarman, son of Āyyavarman, grandson of Mādhava and great grandson of Koṅkaṇivarman. But the greatest point of historical importance in this inscription is that it tells us of Mādhava-Siṃhavarman being installed on the throne by the Pallava king Skandavarman and of his father Āyyavarman being installed by the Pallava king Siṃhavarman. We have seen that Fleet ascribes the Penukonda plates to circa 475 A.D. ; it is therefore almost certain that the Pallava king Siṃhavarman who installed Āyyavarman, father of the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Siṃhavarman of the Penukonda plates, is identical with the Pallava king Siṃhavarman who, according to the *Lokavibhāga*, began to rule in A. D. 436.

(iii) The third point of importance is supplied by the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, which refers to the Gupta king's conflict with a certain *Kāñceyaka* Viṣṇugopa. This "Viṣṇugopa of Kāñci" has been taken by all scholars to have belonged to the family of the Pallavas. Samudragupta is believed to have reigned from circa 330 to 375 A.D. This dating appears possible from the facts that his father Candragupta I began to rule in A. D. 320¹ and that the earliest date of his son Candragupta II, according to the Mathura inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 1ff), is (Gupta 61 + 320 =) 381 A. D. Since it is proved from the Prakrit records that the Pallavas were master of the kingdom of Kāñci during the first half of the fourth century A. D., it is almost certain that the *Kāñceyaka* Viṣṇugopa of the Allahabad pillar inscription was a Pallava king who ruled in the middle of that century which is the time of Samudragupta's South Indian campaign.

Let us now see whether these three Pallava kings—Siṃhavarman, Skandavarman and Viṣṇugopa, whose date is fairly correct—can be found in the epigraphs of the Pallavas themselves. The evidence of the Penukonda plates recording the installation of two consecutive Gaṅga kings—Āyyavarman, and his son Mādhava-Siṃhavarman who seems to have been named after his father's overlord—by the Pallava kings, Siṃhavarman and Skandavarman, renders it most likely that the Pallava king Siṃhavarman was the father and immediate predecessor of Skandavarman. It is very interesting in this connection to note that the Udayendiran grant (no. 1) of Nandivarman (*Ep. Ind.*, III, 142), issued from Kāñcīpura, is the only known Pallava record, where we find a Pallava king named Siṅghavarman (Siṃhavarman) succeeded by his son Skandavarman. The genealogy given in this record is :

1. Skandavarman I ; his son
2. Siṅghavarman ; his son

1. Smith, *Ear. Hist. Ind.*, 4th ed., p. 295. "The first year of the Gupta era, which continued in use for several centuries, and in countries widely separated, ran from February 26, A. D. 320, to March 13, 321, of which dates the former may be taken as that of the coronation of Chandragupta I."

3. Skandavarman II ; his son
4. Nandivarman.

These four kings are mentioned exactly in the same order in the Vayalur grant of Rājasimha (*ibid.*, XVIII, 150 ; see Nos. 41-44), though the relation of one with the others is not specified there. We are therefore inclined to identify the Pallava king Simhavarman of the *Lokavibhāga* and the Penukonda plates and Skandavarman of the latter, with respectively the second and the third king of the above list.

Beside the Udayendiran grant, there is another Sanskrit grant belonging to the early Pallava rulers of Kāñcī. This is the Chendalur grant of Kumāraṣṇu II (*ibid.*, VIII, 233ff.) issued from Kāñcīpura in the king's second regnal year. The grant supplies us with the following line of kings :

1. Mahārāja Skandavarman ; his son
2. Mahārāja Kumāraṣṇu I ; his son
3. Mahārāja Buddhavarman ; his son
4. Mahārāja Kumāraṣṇu II ; 2nd year.

According to Hultzsch (*ibid.*, p. 334), "The alphabet of the Chendalur plates is more archaic than those of the Kūram and Kāśākuḍi plates, but resembles those of the Pīkira, Māṅgalur and Uruvupalli grants, from which it differs chiefly in the omission of horizontal strokes at the top of letters. But a point which stamp it as more modern is the fact that *r*, *k*, and subscribed *u* consist of two vertical lines of nearly equal length, while in the Pīkira, Maṅgalūr and Uruvupalli grants the left line is still considerably shorter. Hence we may conclude that the four Pallava kings of the Chendalur plates ruled in the interval between Simhavarman (*of the Omgodu no. 2, Pīkira and Mangalur grants) and Simhaviṣṇu (*father of Mahendrarvarman I, acc. circa 600 A. D.)."

We have already seen that Simhavarman, the second of the four kings mentioned in the Udayendiram grant, ruled from A. D. 436 to not earlier than A. D. 458. Thus his father Skandavarman I appears to have ruled at Kāñcī about the first quarter of the fifth century, and his grandson Nandivarman seems to have ended his rule about the beginning of the sixth century A. D. The accession of Mahendrarvarman I to the throne of Kāñcī is supposed to have taken place about the end of the same century, owing to his being an older contemporary of the Western Calukya king Pulakeśin II (A. D. 608-642). Mahendrarvarman I was preceded by his father Simhaviṣṇu and grandfather Simhavarman (see verses 10-11 of the Velurpalaiyam grant ; S. I. I., Vol. II, p. 363). Between Nandivarman, the issuer of the Udayendiram grant, who seems to have ruled up to the beginning of the sixth century and Simhavarman, grandfather of Mahendrarvarman I, the Vayalur record places three kings named (1) Simhavarman, (2) Simhavarman and (3) Visṇugopa.

The Vayalur grant thus places five kings between Nandivarman and Mahendravarman I, i. e. in the sixth century A. D. roughly. Since the rule of five kings covering about a century does not appear impossible, since the existence of four earlier kings (Nos. 41-44 of the Vayalur list) has been proved by the Udayendiram grant and since it is possible that the Greater Pallavas of the line of Mahendravarman I did not forget even their immediate predecessors, the three kings (Nos. 45-47) placed by the Vayalur record between Nandivarman and Mahendravarman's grandfather may be historical persons, though we have as yet no corroborative proof of their existence. We therefore think that the four kings of Kāñcī mentioned in the Chendalur grant ruled before the kings of the Udayendiram grant. The kings of the Chendalur record however appear to have ruled after Viṣṇugopa who came in conflict with Samudragupta in the middle of the fourth century A. D. We have already seen that in the first half of the fourth century Kāñcī was occupied by the Pallava kings who issued the Prakrit charters.

There are references to some Pallava rulers of Kāñcī in the inscriptions of the Kadambas. An epigraph of the Kadamba king Ravivarman (Ind. Ant., VI, 29) mentions Caṇḍadaṇḍa, the lord of Kāñcī, who was defeated by the Kadamba monarch. We do not definitely know whether Caṇḍadaṇḍa is the name or a *biruda* of the ruler of Kāñcī who fought with Ravivarman. He cannot be satisfactorily identified with any king of the traditional list of early Pallava kings. His contemporary, the Kadamba king Ravivarman appears to have ruled about the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century (497-557 A. D. according to *Kadamba-kula* by Moraes). The Anaji inscription (*Ep. Carn.*, XI, p. 142) mentions a Pallava king whose name has been read as Nanakkāsa and who was possibly a contemporary of the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I. But the reading of the name Nanakkāsa is doubtful.¹ According to Moraes, Kṛṣṇavarman I ruled from 475 to 480. A. D. Another Pallava king named Śāntivarman or Śāntivaravarman has been mentioned in the Hebbata plates (*An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep.*, 1925, p. 98) of the Kadamba king Viṣṇuvarman. This Pallava king is possibly also mentioned in the Birur plates (*Ep. Carn.*, VI, p. 91). But he cannot be satisfactorily identified with any of the Pallava kings known from the traditional list. It must also be noticed that excepting Caṇḍadaṇḍa none of these kings is expressly said to have ruled at Kāñcī.

We thus come to know of the following early Pallava kings who appear to have ruled at Kāñcī before the rise of the Greater Pallavas of Mahendravarman's line :

1. Father of Śivaskandavarman ; about the end of the third century A. D. ; his son

1. In *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 22 note, it has been suggested that the reading of the passage would be *sva-dēta-kāyena niṣkāśita*. If this reading is to be accepted, the name of the Pallava king referred to in the Anaji inscription is not as yet known.

2. Śivaskandavarman ; about the beginning of the fourth century ; issued the Prakrit grants discovered at Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli.

3. Skandavarman ; the British Museum grant was issued in his reign ; he is not definitely known to have ruled at Kāñci.

4. Viṣṇugopa ; came in conflict with Samudragupta (circa 330-375 A. D.) about the middle of the fourth century A. D.

5. Skandavarman ; his son

6. Kumāraviṣṇu I¹ ; his son

7. Buddhavarman ; his son

8. Kumāraviṣṇu II ; issued the Chendalur grant.

9. Skandavarman (I) ; his son

10. Siṃhavarman ; he ascended the throne in A. D. 436 and ruled at least upto A. D. 458 ; his son

11. Skandavarman (II) ; his son

12. Nandivarman ; issued the Udayendiram grant.

13. Caṇḍaṇḍa, who came in conflict with the Kadamba king Ravivarman about the first quarter of the sixth century. *Caṇḍaṇḍa* may have been a *biruda* of No. 12 or possibly of one of his three successors mentioned in the Vayalur grant (Nos. 45-47).

14. Siṃhavarman I² ; his son

15. Siṃhaviṣṇu ; his son

16. Mahendravarman I ; ascended the throne about A. D. 600.

1. May this Kumāraviṣṇu I be identical with Kumāraviṣṇu, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Omgodu grant no. 1 ? The first difficulty in this identification is that Kumāraviṣṇu of the Omgodu (no. 1) grant has been called a performer of the *Āvamedha* sacrifice, while the Chendalur grant does not credit Kumāraviṣṇu I with any such distinction. This is however an *argumentum ex silentio*. Another difficulty is that while according to the Chendalur grant Kumāraviṣṇu I was succeeded by his son Buddhavarman and grandson Kumāraviṣṇu II, according to the Omgodu grant no. 1 Kumāraviṣṇu was succeeded by his son Skandavarman I, grandson Viravarman and great-grandson Skandavarman II. In this connection we must notice that the Vayalur record places a Skandavarman between Buddhavarman and Kumāraviṣṇu II. May it be that this Skandavarman was a son of Kumāraviṣṇu I, who was made a viceroy of the northern part of the Pallava kingdom and eventually carved out a principality there ? In the Omgodu grant no. 1 Skandavarman I, son of Kumāraviṣṇu, has been called *śva-vīry-ādhigata-rājya*, which epithet possibly supports the above suggestion.

2. It is doubtful whether Siṃhavarman, grandfather of Mahendravarman I, ruled at Kāñci.

APPENDIX.

THE VAYALUR LIST OF EARLY PALLAVA KINGS.

WE have already said that the traditional list of early Pallava kings given in some late records is, in our opinion, not much valuable for the purpose of authentic history. All recent writers on Pallava history however have put much faith in the genealogical list given in the Vayalur grant of Rājasimha. Thus, the late Mr. H. Krishnasastri said, "It looks, therefore, as if the authors of the Kāśākudi, Udayendiram and Velurpalaiyam plates, all of which are admittedly later than the Vayalur record, but not much later, drew these stray names for airing their knowledge of early Pallava chronology purely from memory and were not always correct" (*Ep. Ind.* XVIII, p. 147). This scholar and many others think the Vayalur list historically valuable. There are however reasons to believe that the earlier names of this list are all legendary and unhistorical and that the rest of the list has in it not only the names of a single branch of the Pallava family.

The following is the list of Pallava kings given in the Vayalur record :

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Brahman. | 14. Ghṛtaka. |
| 2. Aṅgirāḥ. | 15. Kaṇḍa. |
| 3. Brhaspati. | 16. Jyāmalla. |
| 4. Śaṃyu. | 17. Ripumalla. |
| 5. Bharadvāja. | 18. Vimala. |
| 6. Droṇa. | 19. Koṅgaṇi. |
| 7. Aśvatthāman. | 20. Kālabhartā. ³ |
| 8. Pallava. ¹ | 21. Cūtapallava. |
| 9. Aśoka. ² | 22. Vīrakūrca (I). ⁴ |
| 10. Harigupta. | 23. Candravarman. |
| 11. Bhūtadatta. | 24. Karāla. |
| 12. Sūryavarman. | 25. Viṣṇugopa (II). |
| 13. Viṣṇugopa (I). | 26. Skandamūla. |

1. Nos. 1—8 are also mentioned in the Kuram (*S. I. I.*, I, 144 ff.), Udayendiram no. 2 (*Ind. Ant.*, VIII, 273) and Velurpalaiyam plates (*S. I. I.*, II, 508). These names are evidently legendary.

2. Aśoka is mentioned in the Kasakudi (*S. I. I.*, II, 342) and Velurpalaiyam plates. In the latter inscription he is called Aśokavarman. According to Hultzsch, the name is a modification of Aśoka, the great Maurya king of Pāṭaliputra.

3. There is no proof that Nos. 10—20 were historical persons.

4. He was possibly the first king of the family.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 27. Kāṇagopa. | 39. Siṃhavarman (I). |
| 28. Vīrakūrca (II). ¹ | 40. Vīravarman. |
| 29. Skandavarman (I). | 41. Skandavarman (V). |
| 30. Kumāraviṣṇu (I). | 42. Siṃhavarman (II). ⁴ |
| 31. Buddhavarman (I). | 43. Skandavarman (VI). |
| 32. Skandavarman (II). | 44. Nandivarman. ⁵ |
| 33. Kumāraviṣṇu (II). ² | 45. Siṃhavarman (III). |
| 34. Buddhavarman (II). | 46. Siṃhavarman (IV). ¹ |
| 35. Skandavarman (III). | 47. Viṣṇugopa (IV). |
| 36. Viṣṇugopa (III). ³ | 48. Siṃhavarman (V). |
| 37. Viṣṇudāsa. | 49. Siṃhaviṣṇu. |
| 38. Skandavarman (IV). | 50. Mahendravarman ; etc., etc. ⁴ |

1. The Velurpalaiyam record appears to identify Vīrakūrca I (No. 22) with Vīrakūrca II (No. 28). This fact possibly shows that Nos. 23-27 are unhistorical. May Vīrakūrca (II) be identical with Vīrakorcarvarman of the Darsi plate ?

2. This Kumāraviṣṇu II issued the Chendalur grant.

3. This Viṣṇugopa may have been the contemporary of Samudragupta. On palaeographical grounds however the contemporary of Samudragupta (circa 330—375) cannot be placed after the issuer of the Chendalur grant.

4. Possibly the king mentioned in the Penukonda plates of about A.D. 475. According to the *Sakuntala*, he ruled from 436 to about 458 (*Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 331 ff.). Names 40—42 are found consecutively in the genealogy of the Pallavas of the Nellore-Guntur region. See Nos. 4—6 at page 27 above.

5. He issued the Udayendiram grant no. 1.

6. He ascended the throne about 600 A. D.

VI

ŚIVASKANDAVARMAN AND SKANDAVARMAN.

THE earliest known Pallava king is Śivaskandavarman who issued the Mayidavolū and Hirahadagalli grants. In the latter grant Śivaskandavarman refers to his father as *Mahārāja bappasāmi*. Bühler (*Ep. Ind.*, I. p. 8, note 15) and following him many other scholars think that *Bappa* is probably the name of Śivaskandavarman's father ; and in this connection Fleet's article in *Ind. Ant.*, XV, p. 272, is referred to. *Bappa* of course may signify a personal name, as we find this name in the list of recipients of the gift recorded in the Hirahadagalli grant itself.¹ We must however remember that in many early copper-plate grants including some of the Pallavas, the kings called themselves *bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādu bhakta*, "devoted to the feet of the lord, the father." The word *bappa* there means "father" and cannot be a personal name, as the fathers of those kings are definitely known to have borne names having no connection with the word *bappa*. It must also be noted that the traditional lists of early Pallava kings do not mention any name even slightly resembling *Bappa*. *Bappa* therefore cannot be taken as the name of Śivaskandavarman's father without further evidence.

In the time of Śivaskandavarman the Pallava kingdom of Kāñci certainly included the Andhra country in the north and the Bellary district in the north-west. From the Penukonda plates of the Gaṅga king Mādhava we know that in the middle of the fifth century the Gaṅgas of Mysore acknowledged the suzerainty of the Pallavas of Kāñci. It is possible that this region was under the Pallavas as early as the time of Śivaskandavarman who was the most powerful king among the early Pallavas. This suggestion seems to be supported by the Talgunda inscription according to which the early Kadambas of Banavāsi (a place to the west of Mysore) also acknowledged Pallava supremacy.²

1 Cf. *Bappa* the name of the progenitor of the Guhilots of Mewar.

2. According to the Talgunda inscription of Kadamba Śāntivarman, Mayūraśarman went to Kāñci for studying the Vedas. There he took part in the *pallav-āśvasamsthā-kalaha*, became enraged at the treatment he received there, and then, having trained himself to warlike exercises, easily overpowered the Pallava frontier guards and established himself at Śrīpervata (in the Kurnool district). The Pallava king took the field against him ; but being unable to subdue him installed him as king over the territory extending from the Western Ocean (Arabian sea) to the Prehāra (river ?). But what is the meaning of *āśvasamsthā kalaha* ? According to the lexicon *Trikāṇḍakeśa*, the word *samsthā* means *kratu* i.e. sacrifice. (Cf. *samsthāḥ samāpti-kratuhṣ carat* = *ca nija-rāṣṭragah*, verse 753). May then the word *āśvasamsthā* mean Horse sacrifice ? (See *Journ. Ind. Hist*, XII, p. 354 ff.). If this explanation is acceptable, it would appear that the quarrel of Mayūraśarman with the Pallavas arose in connection with an *Āśvamedha* sacrifice. Among the Early Pallavas only Śivaskandavarman and Kumāravijaya of the Omgodu (no. 1) grant are known to have performed the Horse-sacrifice. Mayūraśarman was possibly a contemporary of one of these kings. As we have seen, these two kings were not far from each other in time. It is therefore possible that even at the time of Śivaskandavarman the Pallava kingdom extended upto the Arabian sea in the west.

Mayūraśarman, the first king of the Kadamba family, is there said to have been installed by the Pallava king of Kāñci. This Mayūraśarman cannot be placed long after Śivaskandavarman. We have seen that Śivaskandavarman ruled in the beginning of the fourth century, while scholars place Mayūraśarman about the middle of the same century (*Anc. Hist. Dec.*, pp. 95-96; *Kadamba-kula*, p. 18). Indeed the Prakrit language of the Chandravalli inscription of Mayūraśarman (*Ann. Rep. Mys. Arch. Surv.*, 1929, p. 50) shows that this Kadamba king ruled sometime later than the accession of Śivaskandavarman. The use of *ś* (1. 1) and the numerous double consonants like *mm* (1. 1), *tr*, *ll* (1. 2), *sth*, *nd* (1. 3), etc., appears to prove that the Chandravalli inscription was engraved not long after the execution of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants of Śivaskandavarman. He can therefore be rightly placed about the middle of the fourth century A.D.

1. The Mayidavolu grant was issued from Kāñcipura by the Pallava *Yuvamahārāja* Sivakhaṇḍavarma (= Śivaskandavarman) on the fifth lunar day of the sixth fortnight of summer in the 10th year of the reigning Pallava king who was almost certainly the father of the *Yuvamahārāja*, but whose name is not mentioned in the grant. By this grant the Pallava crown-prince, for the increase of his victory, religious merit and strength, offered with libations of water the village of Viripāra situated in the Andhāpatha (= Andhrāpatha) to two Brāhmaṇas, Puvakeṭṭuja and Gonaṇḍija, who belonged to the Agniveśya gotra. The executor of the grant was Śivaskandavarman himself, and the order was accordingly sent to the *vāpata* (*vyāpṛta*), i. e. governor, of Dhaṇṇakaṇḍa (Dhānyakaṇḍa). Dhaṇṇakaṇḍa which has been identified by different scholars with Dharanikoṭa, Amarāvati, Bezvāḍa and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, was evidently the headquarters of the Andhra province incorporated in the Pallava kingdom. To the village of Viripāra were granted all the immunities enjoyed by the *Brahmadeyas*.¹ The word *brahmadeya* therefore means not only "a *deya* (grant) to Brāhmaṇas," but like the technical terms *brahmatrā*, *devatrā*, *devasūt*, etc. signifies a religious donation which implied certain immunities. Of the immunities or *parihāras*, the following only are specified in the Mayidavolu grant. (1) *A-loṇa-khādaka*, (2) *A-raṭhasaṃvinayika*, (3) *A-paramparā-balivadhā*, (4) *A-bhūḍa-pavesā* and (5) *A-kūra-colaka-vināsi-khaṭā-saṃvāsa*.

A-loṇa-khādaka is in Sanskrit *a-lavaṇa-khātuka*; by this immunity the grantor gave up the royal right of digging salt in the village granted. About the next *parihāra* Senart says (*Ep. Ind.*, VI, p. 68), "The word seems to represent *arāśṭrasaṃvinayika*; but etymology alone is an unsafe guide in the interpretation of technical terms. *Vineti* is only used in a moral sense. Could we think of translating: 'exempted from the police,

1. According to Kauṭilya's *Arthasāstra* (Samasastry's 2nd ed. p. 47), "those who perform sacrifices (*ṛtvik*), spiritual guides (*ācārya*) priests (*purohita*), and those learned in the Vedas (*śrotriya*) shall be granted Brahmadeya lands yielding sufficient produce (*abhirupadāyaka*) and exempted from taxes and fines (*a-daṇḍa-kara*)". Brahmadeya is also mentioned when Kauṭilya says (II, 20) that the *daṇḍa* (rod) of 8 cubits (192 *angulis*) in length was used in measuring Brahmadeya and Āstithya lands.

the magistrate of the district (*rāshṭra* ; compare Dr. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 32 note), or of a *rāshṭrin* ? This would remind us of those grants in which, on the other hand, it is stated that the right of punishing thefts and offences is reserved by the king, or of those in which the right to punish the 'ten offences' (*sadaśūparādha* ; see, e.g. the Ālīna plates, l. 67 in Dr. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 179 and the Dēś-Baraṇārka inscription, l. 17, *ibid.*, p. 217) is transferred to the donee." *A-paramparā-bali-vadha* has been called *a-paramparā-balivadha-gaḥaṇa* in the Hirahadagalli grant and has been translated by Bühler as "free from the taking of the oxen in succession". This *parihāra* seems to suggest that the villagers had to supply bullocks for the bullock-carts used by royal officers when the latter went on a tour through the country. *Abhādapareśa* implies that no troupes should enter the village of Viripāra and cause disturbances. Battles therefore could not be fought on the fields of this village. The next *parihāra* is very important. According to Hultzsch, *kūra* means "boiled rice" and *colaka* (*collaka* of the Hirahadagalli grant) is the same as *cullakī* i.e. pot. The word *vināsi* has not as yet been explained. Possibly it means "fuel". The words *khaṭvā* and *saṃvāsa* respectively mean "cot" and "dwelling". This *parihāra* then implies exemption from the obligation of supplying boiled rice, water-pots, *vināsi*, cots and dwellings to the officers who visited the place. In this connection it is interesting to note the views of Manu (VII, vv. 115-119). According to this law-giver, the king must appoint a headman called *grāmika* over each village, a *daśin* or *daśeśa* over each unit of ten villages, a *viṃśatīśa* over each unit of twenty villages, a *śateśa* over each unit of hundred villages and a *sahasādhipati* over each unit of thousand villages. As remuneration, the head of thousand villages should enjoy a city, that of hundred villages a village, that of twenty villages five *kulas* of land, that of ten villages one *kula* of land, but

yāni rāja-pradeyāni pratyahaṃ grāma-vāsibhiḥ |
anna-pān-endhan-ādīni grāmikas = tān = avāpnuyāt ||

"The headman of the village should get all of what is daily payable by the villagers to the king in the shape of food (*anna*), drink (*pāna*) fuel and other things (*indhan-ādī*)". By the above *parihāra* then the village would appear to have been exempted from its dues to the *grāmika*. But the words *khaṭvā* (cot) and *saṃvāsa* (dwelling) should possibly be referred to officers who came to the village on tour, the *grāmika* being probably more or less a settled inhabitant of the village. In connection with this *parihāra* we must also refer to line 8 of the Kudgere grant of Kadamba Mādhātvarman (*Ep. Ind.*, VI, p. 12) where the immunity is mentioned as *a-khaṭvā-vās-audana*, "exempt from (the duty of providing) cots, abodes and boiled rice".¹

The villagers of Viripāra and the royal officials are asked to exempt the village and to cause it to be exempted with all the above *parihāras*. It is also said that one who

1 A Tamil record of A. D. 1407 refers to revenue in rice (*sakala-bhakti-dāya*) and another of 1240 mentions "all the revenue in paddy excluding tolls and the small tax for the village police and, including the three handfuls of paddy ; the rice in Kārtika"; etc. (*S. I. I.*, I, pp. 82, 89).

would transgress the royal edict and would give or cause to be given any trouble or annoyance to the donees, on him the royal authority should inflict bodily punishment.

The ends of the ring that holds the plates together are secure in an elliptical seal which bears in relief "an animal couchant and facing the proper right—apparently a bull, as it has a hump on its back—and below it the legend *Śivaska* (*ndavarmamah*?) in an alphabet which appears to be slightly different from that of the inscription" (*ibid.*, p. 84). The seals seem to have been kept ready in the record-office and were attached to a set of copperplates when the latter was prepared.

At the beginning of the Mayidavolu grant, there is the word *diṭham*, i. e. "has been seen", exactly as on the last plate of the Hirahadagalli grant. This possibly refers to a practice of examining the grants after the copying of the plates from a set kept in the king's record-office.

II. Hirahadagalli is a place in the modern Bellary district of the Madras Presidency. The copper-plate grant discovered there was issued from Kāncipura on the fifth day of the sixth fortnight of the rainy season in the 8th year of the Pallava Dharmamahārājādhirāja Śivaskandavarman who is said to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra and is credited with the performance of the Agniṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aśvamedha sacrifices. By this record the king granted a garden situated in the southern boundary of a village called Cillarekakoḍumka as a *parihāra*, i. e. an honorific grant (see *Manusamhitā*, VII, v. 201). Two *nivartanas* of land were also granted in a village called Āpiṭṭi, one for a threshing floor, and the other for a house, along with four *Addhikās* and two *Kolikās*. The grant was made in favour of a number of Brāhmanas, the chief among whom was Agisamaja (= Agniśarmāya). *Addhikā* (= *Ārdhika*) according to Bühler is "a labourer receiving half the produce." It has been referred to in the Ellore grant of Śaṅkayana Devavarman as *Addhiya-manussa* (see *Mitākṣarā* on Yājñavalkya, I. 166). *Kolikā*, as Bühler says (*Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 9, note), "corresponds to Sanskrit Kaulikāḥ and may mean 'weavers'. But it is also possible to think of the well-known tribe of the Kolis, who are slaves."

The village of Cillarekakoḍumka, as also possibly Āpiṭṭi, was situated in the Sātāhani-*raṭṭha* (Sātavāhaniya-*rāṣṭra*) which is evidently the same as Sātavāhani-hāra mentioned in the Myakadoni inscription of Pulumāvi (*ibid.*, XIV, p. 153) and corresponds roughly to the present Bellary district. The garden of Cillarekakoḍumka is said to have been originally granted by Śivaskandavarman's father. This part of the old Sātavāhana empire was therefore occupied by the Pallavas as early as the time of the king, *ca.* before circa 300 A. D.

The following officials, employed in the different parts of the *viṣaya*, have been mentioned in connection with the observance of immunities: (1) Rājakumāra, (2) Senapati, (3) Rājā, (4) Māḍavika, (5) Desādhikata, (6) Gāmāgāmabhojaka, (7) Vallava, (8) Gopallava, (9) Amacca, (10) Ārakhādihikata, (11) Gumika, (12) Tūthika, and (13) Navika. Along with these are also mentioned (14) the Samcarantakas and (15) the

Bhagamatusas who might be sent by the king to the villages in order to execute any commission (*ahma-pesana-ppayutta*). *Rājakumāra* seems to refer to princes who possibly acted as viceroys of the king, *Senāpati* is obviously "leader of the army". The word *Raṭṭhika* is equivalent to Sanskrit *Rāṣṭrika* i. e. governor of a *rāṣṭra*. As regards the next term, Bühler says (*ibid.*, I, p. 7, note), "I consider the correction *māṇḍavika* as certain and take the word *maṇḍaba* or *maṇḍapu*, from which it has been derived, in the sense of modern *māṇḍavī*, 'custom-house'.—See Molesworth, *Marathi Dictionary*, sub voce." Leumann however thinks that *māṇḍavika* is the same as *māḍambika*, i. e. "chief of a *maḍamba* district". *Deśādhikata* (= *Deśādhikṛta*) is "ruler of a *Deśa*." *Gāmāgāmabhojaka* has been translated by Bühler as "freeholders of various villages." This meaning of the word *bhojaka* is supported by its use in line 8 of the Hirahadagalli grant where the donees are called *Cillarekakoḍumka-bhojaka*. In justifying the form *gāmāgāmabhojaka*, Fausbøll points out that repetitions of the same word with a lengthening of the final vowel of the first are commonly used in Pāli in order to inditate the *vippsā* (*loc. cit.*, p. 7, note). According to Amara, the word *vallava* means *gopa* which is obviously the same as *go-vallava* of this inscription. *Vallava* therefore seems to be the same as *vallabha* which is so common in early South Indian inscriptions and is according to Jātādhara, the same as *aśva-rakṣa* (keeper of horses). Bühler has translated the two terms as "herdsmen" and "cowherds" respectively. *Amacca* is evidently the same as Sanskrit *amātya*, "minister". Leumann thinks that *ārakhādhikata* (= *ārakṣādhikṛta*) means "employed as a guard." Bühler however read the word as *ārāṇādhikata* and translated it as "foresters". *Gumika* (= *gaulmika*) is evidently "head of a *gulma* (outpost of soldiers)." According to Manu (VII, v. 114), a king must place a *gulma* in the centre of two, three, five or hundred villages in order to protect his kingdom (see also Manu, VII, 190, and Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 155). According to Bühler, *Tāthika* may be connected with Prakrit *tūha*, "tīrtha", and possibly means "overseers of fords or of bathing places". With *neyika* may be compared the word *naiyyoka* of the Uruvupalli grant, which Fleet changed to *niyukta* (*Ind. Ant.*, V, p. 52). Bühler thinks that *naiyyoka* is a mistake for *naiyika*, which would exactly correspond to *neyika*, and that both the terms are corruptions of Sanskrit *nāyaka*, which is commonly pronounced *nāieka* and seems to mean a military officer of the rank of corporal or sergeant (*Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 8, note 13). It however seems to me that neither Fleet nor Bühler is justified in the interpretation of *neyika*. *Naiyyoka* of the Uruvupalli grant is evidently a mistake for *naiyogika* which word we find in the Chendalur grant of Kumāraviṣṇu II (*Ibid.*, VIII, p. 233). The word is derived from *niyoga* and is evidently the same as *niyogin* which, according to Hemachandra, is synonymous with *karmasāciva*, *āyukta* and *vyāpṛta*. A *vyāpṛta* is known from the Kondamudi grant to have been ruler of an *āhāra*. An *āyukta* is mentioned in an inscription of Budhagupta as a *viśaya-pati* (*ibid.*, XV, 139). *Naiyogika* (or *niyogin*) may therefore be supposed to have been the ruler of some territorial division. The *snācarantakas* are "spies" (see Manu, VII, 122) and the *bhaṭamanuṣyas* are "soldiers."

The grant is said to have been confirmed by libation of water (*udakādiṃ*) and made valid as long as the moon and stars endure (*ā-cāṃda-tārakālika kātūnaṃ*). All the eighteen kinds of *parihāras* were granted. The inhabitants of the *viṣaya*, specially those of Āpiṭṭi and Cillarekekakoḍuṃka, were ordered to observe the *parihāras* and to see that they were observed by others. The king says, "Now, if anybody, knowing this, proud of being a favourite of the king, should cause or cause to be caused a smaller obstacle to the donees, him, forsooth, we shall restrain by punishment. And further I pray both the future great warriors of our Pallava race who may rule within a period exceeding one hundred thousand years, as well as kings differing from us in descent, saying unto them : 'To him' among you blessings, who in his time makes the people act according to the rule written above. But he who acts contrary to it shall be the lowest of men loaded with the guilt of the five mortal sins'."

Of the eighteen kinds of *parihāras* the grant specifies the following : (1) *A-kūra-collaka-vinesi-khuṭṭā-vāsa*, (2) *A-dudha-dadhi-gaḥaṇa*, (3) *A-raṭṭha-saṃvinayika*, (4) *A-loṇa-guḷa-cchobha*, (5) *A-kara-veṭṭhi-koṃjala*, (6) *A-paramparā-balivadha-gaḥaṇa*, (7) *A-loṇa-kuṭṭha-gaḥaṇa*, and (8) *A-haritaka-sāka-pupha-gaḥaṇa*. The first *parihāra* has already been explained in connection with the Mayidavolu grant. The next *parihāra*, viz. *A-dudha-dadhi-gaḥaṇa*, made the village free from the obligation of supplying sweet and sour milk, and appears to fall under the category of *pāna*, daily payable by the villagers to the *grāmika* (see Manu quoted above). *A-raṭṭha-saṃvinayika* has been explained. *A-loṇa-guḷa-cchobha* (*a-lavaṇa-guḷa-kṣobha*) has been translated by Bühler as "free from troubles about salt and sugar". That digging pits for extracting salt was a royal monopoly is known from a number of inscriptions which refer to *parihāras* like *a-loṇa-khādaka* (= *a-lavaṇa-khātaka*), *a-lavaṇa-kreṇī-khanaka* (C. I. I., III, Nos. 55, line 28, and 56) and *sa-loḥa-lavaṇ-ākara* (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 101). The word *guḷa*, mentioned along with *loṇa*, shows that the manufacture of sugar was also a royal monopoly. The next *parihāra* means exemption from taxes, forced labour, and *koṃjala*, the meaning of which is not known. *A-paramparā-balivadha-gaḥaṇa* has already been explained. The following immunity exempted the village from the obligation of supplying grass and wood (cf. *indhana* in the passage quoted from Manu). The last *parihāra* of the list seems to signify exemption from supplying myrobalan, vegetables and flowers. Bühler says (*ibid.*, I, p. 8, note 28), "Milk, grass, fire-wood, vegetables and so forth had to be furnished gratis by the villagers to royal officers and their servants. The custom still prevails in many native states." See also Manu quoted above.

The grant was executed by the king himself and the plates were prepared in the hand-writing of his privy-councillor (*rahasyādhiprta*) Bhaṭṭisamma who was the *bhojaka* (*ināmdār*) of Kolivāla.

The Hirahadagalli plates are held together by a ring to which an almost circular

and somewhat battered seal, about an inch in diameter, is attached. The emblem on the seal is an animal facing the proper right, which, according to Bühler, may be intended for a deer or a horse.¹ Below the emblem stands the word *Śivaskandavarmanah* the last three letters of which are defaced and doubtful. It is certain that the legend on the seal was written in Sanskrit like the *maṅgala* at the end of the inscription which reads *svasti go-brāhmaṇa-lekhaka-vācaka-śrotṛbhyaḥ iti*. This along with the fact that the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants sometimes express double consonants by two letters show that these two grants were executed in a time when Sanskrit had already made its way in the field of South Indian epigraphy.

III. The British Museum plates appear to have been originally found at Kondakur in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency. They were issued in the reign of *sirivijaya*-Khandavamma (Skandavarman). We have already discussed about the identification of Śivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants and Skandavarman of the British Museum grant and have shown that the identification is extremely doubtful.

The donor of the grant is Cārudevī, wife (*devī*) of the Pallava Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman and mother of a prince whose name has been conjecturally read by Hultzsch as Budhyaṅkura. The relation of Mahārāja Skandavarman and Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman is not specified in the grant.

By this grant Cārudevī seems to have addressed the villagers and officials at Kaṭaka (Kaṭaka) to the effect that a certain field to be ploughed by Ātuka on the western side of the drinking well below the *rāja-taḍāya*, containing four *nivartanas* of land, had been given by her highness for the increase of her highness's life and power, to the god Nārāyaṇa of the Kuḷi-mahātāraka temple at Dālura. This *Kuḷi-mahātāraka-devakula* appears to signify a temple established by a Mahattara named Kuḷi. The villagers and officials have been asked to exempt the field with all immunities and to cause it to be exempted. The executor of the grant was Rohanigutta (Rohinigupta).

The most interesting feature of the grant is that though it is written in Prakrit; it contains two imprecatory verses (*bahubhir*, = *paśudhī dattā* etc.) which are in Sanskrit and are so common in the Sanskrit copper-plate grants. This fact and the fact that the grant expresses double consonants, in all cases, with two letters, appear to suggest that the British Museum grant is slightly later than the grants of Śivaskandavarman.

The seal of Skandavarman attached to the British Museum grant bears a standing animal which faces the proper right and looks like a deer, but must be meant for a bull, the crest of the Pallavas (cf. *Bom. Gaz.*, I, ii, p. 319, note 5), and, over the back of the bull, a few indistinct symbols which may be taken for the sun, a crescent, and perhaps one or more stars (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 144).

1. The animal is most probably a bull which was the crest of the Pallavas (see *Bom. Gaz.*, I, ii, p. 319, note 5).

VII

CHENDALUR GRANT OF KUMĀRAVIṢṢU II

THE Chendalur grant was issued from *viṣaya*-Kāñcīpura in the fifth *tithi* of the bright half of Kārtika in the 2nd regnal of the Pallava king Kumāraviṣṣu II, who was the son of Mahārāja Buddhavarman, grandson of Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṣu I and great-grandson of Mahārāja Skandavarman.

Like many other Pallava rulers, Kumāraviṣṣu II calls himself *Kaliyuga-doṣ-ūva-sanna dharm-oddharaṇa-nitya-sannaddha*. This epithet is also used by Viṣṇugopavarman, Siṃhavarman, and Nandivarman of the Udayendiram grant. The Pallava kings thus appear to have boasted of being called "Defender of Faith"; and the epithet possibly refers to the fact that they were determined to purify their Brahmanical faith which was influenced by heretical doctrines like Buddhism in the time of the later Śātavāhanas and the Ikṣvākus. Kumāraviṣṣu II has some epithets in common with Viṣṇugopavarman of the Uruvupalli grant. Like Viṣṇugopa and his son Siṃhavarman, he is called *bhagavat-pūdūnudhyāta* and *parama-bhūgavata*, and like the records of those two princes the Chendalur grant begins with the adoration *jitaṃ bhagavata*. He was evidently a Vaiṣṇava in faith.

The record is an order to the villagers of Cendalūra in the Karmākaraśṭra and to all the *naiyogikas* and *vallabhas* employed there. Chendalur, the find-spot of the inscription, is a place in the Ongole Tāluka of the Nellore district. Hultzsch has corrected Karmākaraśṭra as Karmaraśṭra known from several inscriptions. Karmākaraśṭra seems to be the same as Kamakaraṭha mentioned in a Nagarjunikonda inscription.

The word *naiyogika* is derived from *nīyoga* and is evidently the same as *nīyogin* which appears to mean "governor of a district" (cf. *nīyogī karmasasiva ayukto vyapṛtaḥ = ca saḥ*; Hemacandra). *Vallabha* means either the king's favourites or keepers of the royal cattle.

It is said that there were eight hundred *paṭṭikas* (pieces) of *khūs* land (*rāja-vastu bhutvā sthitaṃ*) in the village of Cendalūra, and that by this grant the king offered 432 *paṭṭikās* out of that land as a Brahmadeya (*brahmadeya-maryādayā*) to a Brāhmaṇa named Bhavaskandatrāta who belonged to the Kauṇḍinya gotra and Chāndogya sūtra. The lands given did not include what was previously granted for the enjoyment of gods (*devabhoga-hala-varjjaṃ*). The grant was executed with a hope for the increase of the king's longevity, strength, victory and wealth, in accordance with the *hala-nyaya* (laws regarding the *hala*s, like *devahala*, *bhikṣuḥala*, etc.) and was made immune with all the *parihāras*.

The villagers and officers were ordered to observe the immunities and to see that others observed them. People who would violate this order have been threatened with physical punishment. The charter ends with the *maṅgala—go-brūhmanan* (sic.) *nandatu, sasty = astu praiabhyah*, which reminds us of a similar *maṅgala* at the end of the Hirahadagalli grant of Śivaskandavarman.

The word *paṭṭikā* ordinarily means "a piece of cloth"; on analogy, it seems to mean "a piece of land". We do not know whether *paṭṭika* here signifies a particular land-measure like the *nivartana*. The land is said to have been situated in the Kavacakāra bhoga of the Karmmakarāṣṭra. *Bhoga* is evidently the same as *bhukti* of North Indian inscriptions. It signifies a territorial unit like "district". Cf. Pallava-bhogga (Kāñci ?) mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa* (Ind. Cult., I, p. 111)

UDAYENDIRAM GRANT (No. 1) OF NANDIVARMAN.

THE Udayendiram grant was issued from Kāñcīpura on the fifth *tithi* of the bright half of Vaiśākha, possibly in the first year of the Pallava king Nandivarman, son of Skandavarman II, grandson of Siṃhavarman and great-grandson of Skandavarman I. Like the other reigning Pallava kings, Nandivarman is called *kaliyuga-doṣ-āvasanna-dharmoddharaṇa-nitya-sannaddha*. His epithets *bhagavat-pāḍ-ānudhyāta* and *parama-bhāgavata* along with the fact that his grant begins with the adoration *jitaṃ bhagavatā*, shows that he was a Vaiṣṇava like Viṣṇugopa, Siṃhavarman and Kumāra Viṣṇu II.

Udayendiram, the find-spot of Nandivarman's grant, is a place in the North Arcot district. The grant is full of textual mistakes ; the characters moreover do not belong to the early Pallava period. According to Kielhorn (*Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 143), the grant is to be palaeographically assigned to about A. D. 680 ; according to Fleet however it was fabricated about 955 A. D. But the fact that the four kings mentioned in it are given exactly in the same order in the Vayalur record and that the style and phraseology of the grant are very similar to those of the early Pallava records, seems to prove that the grant was copied, though by an incompetent scribe, from an early genuine record.

By this grant, the Pallava king Nandivarman offered four pieces of *āranya* land in the Kāñcivāyil-grāma of the Aḍeyāra-rāṣṭra, according to *pūrva-bhoga-maryādā*, to a Brāhmaṇa named Kuḷacarman (= Kulaśarman) who was an inhabitant of Kāñcivāyil and belonged to the Kauśika gotra, Pravacana sūtra and Taittirīya caraṇa. The lands were granted in accordance with Brahmadeya-maryādā, with all the immunities and with the exception of devabhoga-hala, for the increase of the king's longevity, strength, victory and wealth. It is said that the four pieces of forest-land in Kāñcivāyil-grāma are to be made immune with all the *parihārus* and that anyone who would violate the order should be physically punished.

The seal of Nandivarman attached to the Udayendiram grant is circular. It contains in bas-relief the figure of a standing bull facing the proper left. There is a much worn and illegible inscription at the margin (*loc. cit.*).

IX

OMGODU GRANT (NO. 1) OF SKANDAVARMAN II.

IN the Omgodu grant (no. 1) of Skandavarman II, the reigning king's great-grandfather, Kumāraviṣṇu, has been called *aśvamedhayājī*, i. e. performer of the Horse-sacrifice. He was therefore a great king who was possibly a successor of Virakorcavarman of the Darsi plate.

Kumāraviṣṇu was succeeded by his son Skandavarman I who is mentioned in the Omgodu (no. 1) and Uruvupalli grants. He is said to have been a *parama-brāhmaṇya*; but his most significant epithet seems to be *sva-vīry-ādihigata-rājya*, which means to say that he obtained the kingdom by his own valour. His father was a powerful king who performed the great aśvamedha sacrifice. The significance of this epithet may therefore be that after the death of Kumāraviṣṇu, Skandavarman I quarrelled with his brother who was probably Kumāraviṣṇu's successor at Kāñci, and carved out a separate principality in the northern part of the Pallava kingdom. Kumāraviṣṇu's successor at Kāñci was possibly Buddhavarman mentioned in the Chendalur grant.

The son and successor of Skandavarman I was Viravarman who has been called "the sole hero in the world" in all the inscriptions. He was possibly a warrior of considerable importance. According to Krishnasastri (*Ep. Ind.*, XV. p. 29), this Viravarman is to be identified with Virakorcavarman of the Darsi plate. Darsi, identified by some scholars with Daśanapura, is a place in the Podili division of the Nellore district. Only the first plate of the Darsi grant has been discovered; it was edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, I, 357. The grant was issued from the *adhiṣṭhāna* of victorious Daśanapura by a Pallava king whose name and genealogy cannot be known until the missing plates of the grant are found. Only the name of Virakorcavarman, great-grandfather of the issuer, is known. The Sanskrit form of the name is Virakūrca which is found in the Vayalur and Velurpalaiyam records. The use of this Prakritised name appears to show that the grant was issued at a time when Prakrit was still lingering in the field of South Indian epigraphy. The identification of this king with Viravarman however seems to me doubtful, since these two distinct forms (viz. Virakūrca and Viravarman) are found as names of different kings in the Vayalur list of early Pallava kings. Virakūrca of the Darsi plate may be the same as (the second) Virakūrca of the Vayalur list.

Viravarman was succeeded by his son who is called *śrī-viśaya*-Skandavarman in his own Omgodu grant (no. 1), but simply Skandavarman in the inscriptions of his descendants. He has some epithets in common with Kumāraviṣṇu I of the Chendalur grant and also with Skandavarman II of the Udayendiran grant. Though

he is not called *parama-bhagavata*, his opithet *bhagavad-bhakti-sadbhāva-sambhāvita sarva-kalyāṇa* in the grants of his grandson shows that he was a Vaiṣṇava.

The Oṃgodu grant (no. 1) was issued from the victorious city of Tambrāpa in the 33rd regnal year of Skandavarman II, on the thirteenth *tithi* of the third Hemantā-pakṣa.¹ This form of dating resembles that used in the early Prakrit grants and is remarkably different from the form of dating used in the Sanskrit grants of the Pallavas. It therefore shows that Skandavarman II ruled not long after the kings of the Prakrit charters. We have already shown that some parts of the Mayidavolu, Hirahadagalli and British Museum grants are written in Sanskrit and that the issuers of those grants could not have ruled long before the kings who issued the Sanskrit grants. We have also suggested that the Sanskrit grants showing considerable Prakrit influence may roughly be placed in the period between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century A.D.¹

By this grant the king made a Brahmadeya of the village of Oṃgodu in the Karma-rāṣṭra, and offered the same with the exception of the *devubhoga-hala*, in a form of *sātvika-dāna*, to a *dvi-veda* and *śaḍaṅga-pūruṅga* Brāhmaṇa named Golaśarman of the Kāśyapa gotra. The Karma-rāṣṭra in which Oṃgodu was situated has been taken to be the same as Kamma-nāḍu of later Telugu inscriptions and has been identified with the northern part of Nellore and southern part of Guntur. According to Krishnasastri (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 254), Oṃgodu may be the same as modern Ongole, the headquarters of the Ongole tāluka of the Guntur district. Of the boundaries of Oṃgodu given in the Oṃgodu grant (no. 2) of Siṃhavarman, Koḍikiṃ may be identical with modern Koniki near Ongole and Penukaparru may be the same as Pinukkiparu mentioned as the family name of certain Brāhmaṇas who were recipients of a village called Taṇdantottam near Kumbakonam (*S. I. I.*, II, pp. 519, 532).

The seal of Skandavarman II attached to the Oṃgodu grant (no. 1) is almost circular. It is totally worn away, and has no trace of any symbols, "though it may be presumed to have had on it originally the recumbent bull, as in the case of other Pallava grants" (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 249).

1. It should however be noticed that two grants of the Kadamba kings Mṛgeśavarman and Ravivarman who ruled about the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century are dated in the old fashion. One is dated in the 4th year of Mṛgeśavarman on the full-moon day of the 8th fortnight of Varṣā (*Ind. Ant.*, vii, pp. 37-38) and the other in the 11th year of Ravivarman on the 10th *tithi* of the 6th fortnight of Hemanta (*ib.*, vi, p. 28). This old way of expressing dates in such a late period is certainly due to Jain influence. The inscription of Mṛgeśa records the grant of a village in three equal shares to the holy Arhat and great Jinendras, to the Mahāśramāṇa-saṃgha of the Śvetapāṭas (i.e. the Śvetāmbara Jains) and to the same of the Nirganthas (i.e. the Digambara Jains). The inscription of Ravivarman records the grant of lands to the Jinas in order that the ceremony of ablution might always be performed without fail on the full-moon days. To the Jain monks the year was divided in seasons and fortnights.

X.

CROWN-PRINCE VIṢṆUGOPA AND DHARMA-MAHĀRĀJA SĪMHAVARMAN.

VIṢṆUGOPA or Viṣṇugopavarman, son of Skandavarman II, did not ascend the throne. His Uruvupalli grant was issued in the 11th year of the reign of Mahārāja Sīmhavarman. Fleet thought that this Sīmhavarman was an elder brother of the Yuvamahārāja (or Yuvarāja) Viṣṇugopavarman. Hultsch, however, suggests that he is no other than Viṣṇugopa's son who issued the Omgodu (no. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants. According to the latter view therefore the Pallava throne passed from Skandavarman II directly to his grandson Sīmhavarman.

In the Uruvupalli grant Viṣṇugopavarman calls himself *prajā-saṃrañjana-paripāl-an-odyoga-satata-satra-vrata-dīkṣita* and *rūjasi-guna-sarva-sandoha-vijigṣu*, which he could not have said if he was not a ruler of subjects. As a crown-prince he was possibly in charge of a district of the Pallava kingdom. The district of which he was the governor probably had its headquarters at Palakkaḍa from where the Uruvupalli grant was issued. As we have already noted, both Viṣṇugopa and his son Sīmhavarman are called *parama-bhūgavata* in the inscriptions all of which begin with the adoration, *jītaṃ bhagavatū*. They were evidently Vaiṣṇava. In this connection, the name *Viṣṇugopa* and the dedication of 200 *nivartanas* of land (595 acres according to Kauṭilya, but 148'6 acres according to his commentator; see *Suc. Sāt. East. Dec.*, p. 41 n.) to the god *Viṣṇuhāra* are also to be noted.

In all the inscriptions of Viṣṇugopa and Sīmhavarman, the Pallavas have been credited with the performance of many *aśvamedhas* or many *kratus*. So far we know only of two Pallava kings who performed the Horse-sacrifice. The first of them is Śivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants, and the second is Kumāraviṣṇu, grandfather of Skandavarman II who issued the Omgodu grant (on. 1). The former is also credited with the performance of the *Agniṣṭoma* and *Vājapeya* sacrifices.

In the Omgodu grant (no. 2) of Sīmhavarman, the Pallavas have been referred to as *vallabha* which is evidently the same as *śrī-vallabha* of the Mangalur grant. It is interesting to note that titles like *śrī-vallabha*, *prthivi-vallabha* etc. were adopted by individual Calukya kings of Badami.¹ We do not know whether the Calukyas appropriat-

1. The Calukya antagonist of Pallava Naraśimhavarman has been called *Vallabha-rāja* (*jetā bahuto vallabha-rājasya* etc. of the Udayendiram grant, no. 2, *Ind. Ant.*, VIII, p. 273). In the Samangadh inscription (*ibid.*, XI, p. 111), the Calukya contemporary of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga (II) has been called *Vallabha*. In the Yevur and Miraj grants (*ibid.*, VIII, pp. 12-14), the Calukyas themselves refer to the greatness of their family

ed the title of the Pallavas. It is however certain that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings who succeeded the Calukyas in the sovereignty of the Deccan appropriated these titles and were therefore known as Vallabharāja. Arabic travellers of the 9th and 10th centuries mention a powerful dynasty of the Balharās who ruled at Mānkīr. According to R. G. Bhandarkar (*Bum. Geog.*, I, Pt. ii, p. 209), Balharā is an Arabic corruption of Vallabharāja and the Balharās of Mānkīr are no other than the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa.¹

I. The Uruvupalli grant of Viṣṇugopavarman was issued from the glorious and victorious *sthāna* of Palakkāḍa. By this grant, the Dharma-yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman, who belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra and the Pallava family, issued an information about his grant to the villagers of Uruvupalli (situated in the Muṇḍarāṣṭra) and an order to all the *āyuktakas*, all the *naiyyokas*, *rāja-vallabhas* and *sañcarantakas* who had to make the following gift of the crown-prince immune with all the *parihāras*. The grant was in the form of 200 *nivartanas* of lands which were made a *devabhoga* to be enjoyed by the god Viṣṇuhāra whose temple called Viṣṇuhāra-devakula was built by the *senūpati* Viṣṇuvarman at a place called Kaṇḍulūra (or Keṇḍukūra). The object of the grant was the increase of longevity and strength of the grantor. It is warned that anyone who would transgress the order would be liable to physical punishment. The plates are said to have been given in the 11th year of Siṃhavarman-mahārāja, on the tenth day of the dark half of Pauṣa.

Āyuktaka which is synonymous with *niyogin*, *karma-saciva* and *vyūpṛta*, seems to mean "governor of a district". The passage *asmin viṣaye sarvāyuktakūḥ* possibly shows that there were several āyuktakas employed in a single *viṣaya*. The word *naiyyoka* is evidently the same as *naiyogika* of the Chendalur grant which is derived from *niyoga* (office, employment) and seems to mean "governor". The word *rāja-vallabha* may signify favourites or subordinates of the Pallava king. It may also possibly refer to keepers of the royal horses or cows². *Sañcarantaka* has already been explained. It is the same as *sañcāra* of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. For the appointment of spies in the king's own state to report him about the conduct of his officials and subjects, see *Manusamhitā*, VII. 122.

as *vallabharāja-lakṣmī*. These are only a few of the examples. Dr. Ray Chaudhuri points out to me that the fuller form of the epithet is *śrī-prthivī-vallabha* which possibly suggests that these Vaiṣṇava kings claimed to have been incarnations of Viṣṇu who is the *vallabha* of both *Śrī* and *Prthivī*. There seems to be an analogy between these kings' upholding *Dharma* from the *Kaliyuga-doga* and Viṣṇu's upholding *Prthivī* from the *Pralaya* in his *Varāha* incarnation. The figures of two queens with each of the two Pallava kings engraved on the portals of the *Varāha* cave (identified by Krishnasastri with Mahendravarman I and his son Narasiṃhavarman Siṃhaviṣṇu) appear to represent symbolically *Śrī* and *Prthivī* (see my note in *Ind. Cult.*, ii, pp. 131—132).

1. "Vallabharāja should, by the rules of Prakrit or vernacular pronunciation, become Vallabha-rāy or Ballabha-rāy. The last is the same as the Balharā of the Arabic" (*loc. cit.*; also pp. 387f.).

2. Cf. *vallava* in the Pīkīra and Hīṭahadagallī grants, and *vallabha* in the Chendalur and Mangalur grants.

The word *devabhoga* is the same as *devatrā*, *devasāt*, *devadeya* and *devadāya*, and signifies "religious donation to a god". In numerous South Indian grants reference is made to the fact that the land is granted with the exception of lands previously given away as *devabhoga-hala*. The word *devahala* has been used in the same sense in the Peddavegi grant of Nandivarman II Śālaṅkāyana (*Suc. Sūt. East. Dec*, p. 80).

The village of Uruvupalli in the Muṇḍarāṣṭra has not yet been identified. The boundary of the field granted is however clearly stated in the charter. The southern and eastern sides of the field were bounded by the river Suprayoga (or Suprayogā). At the northern extremity was a large tamarind tree covered with hills; and the western side was bounded by the villages of Koṇḍamuruvudu, Keṇḍukūra and Kararupūra.

According to Fleet, (*Ind. Ant.*, V. p. 5), "The seal connecting the plates bears the representation of what seems to be a dog, but in native opinion, a lion". The figure is possibly that of a bull.

II. The Oṃgoḍu grant (no. 2) was issued from an un-named *skandhāvūra* on the fifth *tithi* of the bright half of Vaiśākha in the fourth regnal year of Siṃhavarman, son of Viṣṇugopa. By this record, the king granted the village of Oṃgoḍu (previously granted by his grandfather to a Brāhmaṇa named Golaśarman of the Kāśyapa gotra) to a Brāhmaṇa named Devaśarman who was an inhabitant of Koṇḍura and belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. Devaśarman was possibly a relative and heir of Golaśarman. The village of Koṇḍura seems to be the same as the native village of Śivaśarman, recipient of the Polamuru grant of Viṣṇukunḍin Mādhavavarman I, and of Casamiśarman, recipient of the Narasaopet grant of Pallava Viṣṇugopavarman II. The identification of Oṃgoḍu in the Karmarāṣṭra has already been discussed.

The grant is here referred to as *pūrvu-bhoga-vivarjita*, which seems to be the same as *devabhoga-hala-varjita* of other grants. It was endowed with all the *parihāras*, and is said to have been copied from the oral order of the Bhaṭṭāraka, i.e. the king himself. According to Krishnasastri (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 252), the characters of this grant are of a later period than that used in Siṃhavarman's other grants. He is therefore inclined to think that the grant was copied from an original record about the beginning of the 7th century A. D.

In line 22 of the grant, reference is made to an eclipse being the occasion of the grant. It is however contradicted by the details of the date, viz. 5th lunar day of the bright half of Vaiśākha (11. 31-32). Krishnasastri however tried to reconcile the two particulars by supposing "that the grant which was actually made on the new moon day of Chaitra, a possible day for the nearest solar eclipse, was engraved on the copper-plates five days after, i.e. on the 5th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha" (*ibid.*, p. 253)¹.

1. According to Fleet (J. R. A. S., 1915, p. 473), Siṃhavarman, son of Viṣṇugopa, is to be identified with the king of the same name who is known from the *Lokavibhāga* to have ascended the throne in A. D. 436. In A. D. (436 + 3 =) 439 (or 440) however there was no solar eclipse on the newmoon day of Caitra.

III. The Pikira grant of Siṃhavarman was issued from the glorious and victorious camp at the king's residence at Menmātura in his 5th regnal year on the third *tithi* of the bright half of Aśvayuja with a hope for the increase of his longevity, strength and victory. The copper-plates were discovered at Nelalur in the Ongole tāluka of the Guntur district.

By this record, the villagers of Pīkira in the Muṇḍarāṣṭra, as well as the *adhyakṣas*, *vallavas* and *śāsana-saṁcārins* stationed in the rāṣṭra, were informed of the king's gift of the above village, endowed with all the immunities, but with the exception of lands previously granted for the enjoyment of gods, to a Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa named Vilāsa-arman who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. The king says here that, as the village of Pīkira has been made a Brahmadeya, it should be made immune with all *parihāras* by the king's officials who would also see that they be observed by others. Any one transgressing this order is warned to be liable to physical punishment. The word *adhyakṣa* means a "superintendent" or a "ruler" (Apte, S.—E. Dictionary, s. v.; *Gītā*. IX, 10; *Kumārasambhava*, VI, 17).¹ *Vallava* means *gopa* according to Amara; other Pallava inscriptions (e. g. the Chendalur and Mangalur grants) have *vallabha* which means *ghoṭaka-rakṣaka* according to Jaṭādhara (see *Śabdakulpadruma*, s. v. *pālaka*.) According to Amara however *vallabha* means *adhyakṣa* which has been explained by a commentator as *gav-ādhyakṣa* (*ibid.*, s. v.). *Vallabha* is generally taken to signify favourites of the king. *Śāsana-saṁcārins* may be the same as *Śāsana-hara* i.e. messenger; it may also be identical with *saṁcārantaka* of other inscriptions.

The seal of Siṃhavarman attached to the Pikira grant is very much worn, but bears in relief, on a counter-sunk surface, an animal with mouth open and face to the proper left. It is represented as seated on a horizontal line that is in relief. It closely resembles the animal represented on the seal attached to the Uruvupalli grant. The tail and fore-legs of the animal are not seen (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 160).

IV. The Mangalur grant was issued from Daśanapura (identified with Darsi in the Nellore district), on the fifth *tithi* of the bright half of Caitra in the 8th year of Siṃhavarman's reign with the hope of increasing his longevity, strength and victory.

By this record, the king granted the village of Maṅgaḍur in the Veṅgorāṣṭra as a Brahmadeya to the following Brāhmaṇas; (1) Āpastambīya Rudraśarman of the Ātreya gotra, (2) Āpastambīya Tūrkkāśarman of the Vātsāyana gotra, (3) Āpastambīya Dāmaśarman of the Kauśika gotra, (4) Āpastambīya Yajñaśarman of the Bhāradvāja gotra, (5) Āpastambīya Bhavakoṭigupta of the Parāśara gotra and (6)

1. Being connected with *vallava* (cow-herd), may *adhyakṣa* signify *gav-ādhyakṣa*?

Vāiasaneyi Bhartṛśarman, (2) Audamedha, (8) Chandoga, (9) Śivadatta and (10) Hairaṇyakeśa Śaṣṭhikumāra of the Gautama gotra.

The villagers of Maṅgaḍur as well as the *adhyakṣas*, *vallabhas* and Śāsana-saṁcārins were informed of the donation which was endowed with all the immunities, but was with the exception of the devabhoga-hala. The villagers and officials were ordered to observe the immunities themselves and to see also that others observed them. Transgressors of the order were liable to physical punishment.

Veṅgorāṣṭra seems to be the district of Veṅgi which lies between the rivers Krishna and Godavari. This district was in the possession of the Śālaṅkāyanas as early as the time of Ptolemy (140 A.D.). At the time of Siṃhavarman, the southern fringe of the district was possibly occupied by the Pallavas.

INDEX

	Page		Page
Aḍeyārarāṣṭra	...	Baithāna	7, 15
<i>Adhyakṣa</i>	50, 51	Balaghat	20
Adhvaryu	21	Balaśrī-Gautamī	2
Ādityasena	22	Balharā	48
Agisamaja	38	Ballaha-rāy	48
Agniṣṭoma	38, 47	Banavāsi	3, 9, 19, 35
Alina	37	Bappa, <i>Guhilot</i>	35
Allahabad	8, 13, 15, 29	Basaro-nāga	5, 6, 7
<i>Amacca</i>	38	Batoi	5
Amarāvati	3, 16, 36	Bay of Bengal	6
<i>Amātya</i>	39	Bellary Dist.	4, 9, 16, 35, 38
Anaji	31	Bengal	6, 11, 13
Anantapur Dist.	3	Bezwāḍa	36
Ānarta	9	Bhāraśiva	13
Ānartapurī	9	Bharata-Dauṣyanti	22
Andau	15	Bhartṛśarman	51
Andhra, <i>Satavāhana</i>	4	Bhaṭṭāraka	49
Andhra, <i>country</i>	2, 3, 7, 16, 17, 35, 36	Bhavabhūti	22
Andhāpatha	18, 36	Bhavakoṭigupta	50
Āpiṭṭi	38, 40	Bhavaskandatrāta	42
Arabian Sea	35	<i>Bhoga</i>	43
<i>Ārahādrikata (Ārakṣādrikata)</i>	29	<i>Bhojaka</i>	39, 40
Argaru	5, 6	<i>Bhukti</i>	43
Arouarnoi	5, 6, 7	<i>Bhikṣuhala</i>	42
Aruvānāḍu	6	Bhilsa	11
Aśoka, Aśokavarman	1, 12, 33	Birur	20, 31
Aśvamedha	10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 32, 35, 38, 45, 47	Bombay Presidency	3
Aśvatthāman	9, 12, 33	<i>Brahmadeya</i>	36, 42, 44, 46, 50
Ātuka	41	<i>Brahma-kṣatriya</i>	11
Audamedha	51	Bṛhatphalāyana	19
Aurangabad Dist.	7, 15	British Museum	8, 19, 28, 32, 41
<i>Āyukta (Āyuktaka)</i>	39, 48	Buddhavarman, <i>Pallava King</i>	14, 30, 42, 45
Āyyavarman	29	Buddhavarman, <i>Pallava prince</i>	28, 41
Badami	2, 47	Buddhyaṅkura	28, 41

	Page		Page
Budhagupta	39	Damirika	5
Caṇḍa-Śāti, Caṇḍa-Śāta	16	Dantapura	7
Cakora	2	Dantidurga II	47
Calukya	2, 11, 12, 30, 47, 48	Darsi	25, 26, 34, 45, 50
Cāṃtamūla I	17, 18	Daśanapura	25, 45, 50
Cāṃtamūla II	18	Deccan	2, 11, 20, 48
Caṇḍadaṇḍa	31, 32	Deo-Baranārka	37
Caṇḍa-Śātakarṇi	17	<i>Deśadhikāta</i>	38, 39
Caṇḍaśrī	16	<i>Deśadhikṛta</i>	39
Candragupta I	29	<i>Devabhoga</i>	48, 49
Candragupta II	29	<i>Devabhogahala</i>	42, 44, 46, 49, 51
Candragupta, <i>Maurya</i>	2	Devagiri	20
Candra-Śāti	3	<i>Devahala</i>	42, 49
Candraśrī	16	Devaśarman	49
Cārudevī	41	Devavarman	18, 38
Casamiśarman	26, 49	Dharmākaṇḍa	18, 36
Caṣṭana	3, 15, 17	Dhānyakaṭaka	18, 36
Cendalūra	42	Dharaṇikoṭa	36
Ceylon	7	Digambara	46
Chammak	20	Droṇa	11, 12, 33
Chandoga	51	Dudia	20
Chāndogya	42	Dvārakā	9, 22
Chandravalli	19, 36	Eastern Ghat	2
Chendalur	30, 31, 3, 34, 39, 42, 45, 48	Eastern Sea	2
Chinna	16	Ehuvula-Cāṃtamūla	18
Chirko	13	Ellore	38
Chitaldrug Dist.	2, 1	Gaṅgā	11
Chura	26	Gaṅga, <i>dynasty</i>	11, 25, 28, 29, 35
Cillarekakoḍuṃka	38, 39, 40	Ganges	5, 7
Cola	4, 5, 6, 11, 14	Gautamī-Balaśrī	2
<i>Cola-maṇḍala</i>	5, 6, 7	Gautamīputra-Śātakarṇi	2, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16
Coromandel	4, 5, 6, 7	Gautamīputra-Yajña-Śātakarṇi	3, 7
Cuddalore	4	Goālā	13
Cuddapah Dist.	3	Godāvarī, <i>river</i>	7, 51
Curā	26	Godavari Dist.	3, 16
Cūtapallava	12, 13, 35	Gokula	22
Cuṭu-Śātakarṇi	3, 11, 13	Golaśarman	49
Dakṣiṇāpatha	7, 20	Gonaṃdija	36
Dalura	41	Gotra-Agniveśya	36
Dāmaśarman	50	— Ātreya	50

	Page		Page
-Gotra Bhāradvāja	10, 11, 12, 38, 48, 50	Kāḍuveṭṭi	13
— Br̥hatphalāyana	...	Kālabhartā	33
— Gautama	...	Kalalāya-Mahārāṭhi	4
— Kāṇvāyaṇa	...	Kalidāsa	6, 21
— Kāśyapa	26, 46, 49, 50	Kalīṅganagara	11
— Kauṇḍinya	...	Kalīṅgattu-Puraṇi	11
— Kauśika	44, 50	Kalyāṇi	2
— Mānavya	...	Kamakaraṭha	42
— Parāśara	...	Kamara	5
— Vātsāyana	...	Kammanāḍu	46
— Viṣṇuvṛddha	...	Kaṃsa	22
Govardhana	...	Kanakagiri	2
Govindagupta	...	Kāñci, city	1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 28, 29
Grāmika	...		30, 31, 32, 36, 45
Guhilot	...	Kāñci, district	4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 24, 28, 35, 43
Gulma	...	Kāñci-maṇḍala	6
Gumika	38, 39	Kāñcipura	1, 36, 42, 44
Guntur Dist.	17, 21, 24, 26, 34, 41, 46, 50	Kāñcivāyil-grāma	...
Gupta	...	Kandavarman	06
Gupta, dynasty	...	Kaṇḍukūra	48
Gurjara	...	Kararupūra	49
Haidar Āli	...	Karle	9, 19
Hala-nyāya	...	Karmākarāṣṭra	42, 43, 46
Hari	...	Karmarāṣṭa	26, 42, 49
Hastivarman	...	Karma-saciva	39, 48
Hebbata	...	Kasakudi	12, 30, 33
Himālaya	...	Kashmir	1
Hirahadagalli	8, 10, 15, 18, 19, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47	Kaśyapa	23
Horse-sacrifice	10, 20, 22, 23, 35, 45, 47	Kaṭaka	41
Hūṇa	...	Kauṭilya	36
Ikṣvāku	...	Kavacakāra	43
Jaggayyapetta	...	Keṇḍukūra	48, 49
Jain	...	Kharia	13
Jubbulpore Dist.	...	Khryse	5
Junagadh	...	Kistna Dist.	3, 16, 17
Kaccippeḍu	...	Kodavali	3, 16
Kaḍaka	...	Koḍikiṃ	46
Kadamba	3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 25, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 46	Kolandia	5
		Koli	38
		Kolivala	40

	Page		Page
Kolkhi	... 4, 5	Magadha	... 11
Komari	... 4	Mahābhārata	... 3
Kondakur	... 41	Mahabhāṣya	... 1
Kondamudi	... 12, 19, 39	<i>Maharāṭhi</i>	... 4, 8
Koṇḍamuruvudu	... 49	<i>Mahāsenapati</i>	... 8
Koṇḍura	... 49	Mahāśramaṇa-saṃgha	... 4, 6
Koṇiki	... 46	Mahendra, <i>mountain</i>	... 2
Koṇkaṇivarman	... 29	Mahendravarman I	... 30, 34, 48
Korkai	... 4	Mahidhara	... 10
Kottampalugu	... 18	Maisōlia	... 5
Krishna, <i>river</i>	... 51	Moisōloi	... 5
Kṛṣṇa	... 22, 23	Majerika	... 7
Kṛṣṇagiri	... 2	Malanga	... 5, 13
Kṛṣṇavarman I	... 20, 31	Malavalli	... 19
Kṛṣṇavarman II	... 19	Mālavikāgnimitra	... 11
Kudgere	... 37	Malaya	... 2
<i>Kula</i>	... 37	Malkhed	... 2
Kuḷacaraman	... 44	<i>Māṇḍavika</i>	... 39
Kulaipa	... 9	Māndhātṛvarman	... 19, 37
Kulaśarman	... 44	Maṇḍaḍūr	... 50, 51
Kuḷi	... 41	Mangalur	24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 47, 48, 50
Kulottuṅga-Cola	... 11	Manjhira	... 7
Kumāraviṣṇu, <i>of the Nellore-Guntur grants</i>	13, 14, 24, 26, 27, 32, 35, 45	Māṅkīr	... 48
Kumāraviṣṇu I, <i>of the Kāñcī grants</i>	14, 30, 32, 34, 42, 45	Mānyakheta	... 48
Kumāraviṣṇu II	30, 32, 34, 39, 42, 44	Masalia	... 5
Kumārikā	... 4, 21	Maski	... 3
Kumbakoṇam	... 46	Masulipatam	... 5, 6, 7
Kuṇḍur	... 26	Mathurā	... 22
Kuntala	... 11, 13, 20	Matsya	... 9
Kuram	... 30, 33	Matsya Purāṇa	... 15, 16
Kurnool Dist.	... 2, 35	Maurya	... 1, 11
Kuṣāṇa	... 10	Mayidavolu	8, 15, 18, 19, 32, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 46, 47
<i>Māḍavika</i>	... 38	Mayūraśarman	19, 35, 36
Mādhava I	... 29	Menmātura	... 25, 50
Mādhava II	... 28, 29, 35	Mewar	... 35
Mādhavavarman	... 20, 49	Miraj	... 47
Madras, <i>city</i>	... 4	Modoura	... 5
Madras Presidency	... 2, 41, 38	Mṛgeśavarman	... 19, 46
		Mukkaṇṭi	... 13

	Page		Page		
Muṇḍa, <i>tribe</i>	...	13	Paithan	...	7, 15
Muṇḍarāṣṭra	...	48, 49, 53	Palakkaḍa	...	13, 24, 47, 48
Myakadoni	...	4, 16, 38	Palhava	...	9, 10
Mysore	...	2, 9, 35	Pallab	...	13
Nāga	6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14		Pallava, <i>eponym</i>	...	12, 33
Nagarjunikonda	17, 18, 36, 42		Pallava, <i>dynasty</i>	1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10: 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 84, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51	
Nahapāna	...	17	Pallava-bhoga	...	43
<i>Naiyogika</i>	...	39, 42, 48	Pallavamalla-Nandivarman	...	12, 22
<i>Naiyyoka</i>	...	39, 48	Palnad	...	17
Naṇakkāsa	...	31	Pālotkaṭa	...	26
Nandigram	...	17	Pañcāla	...	11
Nandivarman, <i>Pallava King</i>	29, 30, 31, 32, 42, 44		Pandion	...	5, 6
Nandivarman II, <i>Śālaṅkāyana King</i>	...	29, 49	Pandiones	...	5
Nandivarman III, <i>Later Pallava</i>	...	12	Pāṇḍya	...	5
Nandivarman-Pallavamalla	...	12, 22	Pāṇini	...	11
Narasaopet	...	26, 27, 49	<i>Parihāra</i>	40, 42, 44, 48, 49, 50	
Narasimhavarman	...	47, 48	Pāriyātra	...	2
Nārāyaṇa	...	41	Parthian	...	9, 10
Nasik	...	2, 3, 7, 19	Pāṭaliputra	...	1, 33
Nelalur	...	50	Patañjali	...	1
Nellore, <i>city</i>	...	2	Peddavegi	...	29, 49
Nellore Dist.	5, 24, 26, 34, 42, 45, 46, 50		Pennar	...	2, 6
<i>Neyika</i>	...	39	Penukonda	...	28, 29, 34, 35
Nilgiri	...	2	Penukaparru	...	46
Nirgrantha	...	46	Periplus	...	4, 5, 6, 9
Niṣāda	...	22	Pikira	24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 47, 50	
Nisamma	...	5	Pinukkiparu	...	46
Nītimārga-Koṅguṇivarman-Permanaḍi	...	25	Pitundra	...	5
<i>Nivartana</i>	...	43, 48	Podili	...	45
<i>Niyogin</i>	...	39, 42, 48	Podiyil	...	2
Nolamba	...	9	Paduka	...	5
North Arcot Dist.	...	44	Polamuru	...	20, 26, 49
Oḍḍādi	...	9	<i>Pracāṃta</i>	...	2
Omgodu	24, 35, 26, 27, 32, 45, 46, 47, 49		Pravacanasūtra	...	44
Ongole	...	42, 46, 50	Pravarasena I	...	20
Orthoura	...	5	Prehāra	...	35
Ozēṇē	...	15	<i>Prthivivallabha</i>	...	47

	Page		Page
Prthivivāghra	22	Śatakarni	7
Ptolemy	3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 17, 51	Śatakarni-Canḍa	16, 17
Pudukottah	5, 6	—Gautamīputra	2, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17
Pulakeśin I	12	—Rudra	3
Pulakeśin II	12, 30	—Śivaskanda	16, 19
Pulomā	16	—Śivaśrī	3, 16
Pulumāvi	3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 38	—Viṇhukaḍa	19
Pulumāvi-Vasiṣṭhīputra	3, 7, 15, 16, 17, 19	—Yajña	3, 7, 16
Puṣyamitra	... 1, 21	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa	17
Puvakeṭṭu	... 36	Śāta-Śivamaka	3
<i>Rahasyadhikṛta</i>	... 40	Śātavāhana	2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 38, 42
<i>Rājakumāra</i>	... 38, 39	Śātavāhanihāra	4, 38
<i>Rājanya</i>	... 21	Śātavāhaniya-rāṣṭra	38
Rājasimha	12, 30, 33	Śāta-Candra	3
Rājatarāṅgini	1	Satyasena	13
Rāṣṭrakūṭa	2, 11, 47, 48	Scytho-Kuṣana	20
<i>Rūṣṭrika</i>	39	Sena	11
<i>Raṭṭhika</i>	38, 39	Senāni	23
Rautia	13	<i>Senāpati</i>	38, 39
Ravivarman	25, 31, 32, 46	Seṭtagiri	2
Rayakota	9	Sewar	13
Rohanigutta	41	Siam	7
Rohinigupta	41	Simhavarman, of the Nellore-Guntur grants	26, 27, 30, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51
Rikṣavat	2	Simhavarman, of Kāñci	24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 44
Rudradāman	3, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17	Simhavarman, of the Vayalur record (No. 45)	30, 34
Rudraśarman	50	Simhavarman, of the Vayalur record (No. 46)	30, 34
Rudra-Śatakarni	3	Simhavarman, Later Pallava	26, 30, 34
Sadakaṇa-Kaḷalāya	4	Simhavarman-Mādhava	29
Śaka	9, 10	Simhaviṣṇu, Later Pallava...	12, 26, 32
Śākya	23	Simhaviṣṇu-Narasimhavarman	48
Śālaṅkāyana	18, 19, 28, 38, 49, 51	Sindhu	21
Samangadh	... 47	Siriptolemaios	7, 15
Samudragupta	8, 18, 29, 32, 34	Śiva	13
<i>Sangara</i>	... 5	Śivadatta	51
Śāntivaravarman	... 31		
Śāntivarman, Kadamba King	35		
Śāntivarman, Pallava King	31		
<i>Sarpa-yajña</i>	... 23		
Śaṣṭhikumāra	... 51		
Śātavāhani- <i>raṭṭha</i>	... 38		

INDEX

59

	Page		Page
Śivāji	2	Sūryanāga	6
Śivagupta	9	Śuṣkalettra	1
Śivamaka-Sāta	3, 16	Suvarṇagiri	2
Śivaśarman	26	Suviśākha	9
Śivaskandagupta	9, 19	Śvetāmbara	46
Śivaskandanāgaśri, <i>wrongly printed</i>		Śvetapaṭa	46
(l. 7) Śivaskandavarman	19	Taittiriya	44, 50
Śivaskanda-Śātakarṇi	16, 19	Talgunda	35
Śivaskandavarman, <i>King of Banavāsi</i>	19	Tambrāpa	24, 46
Śivaskandavarman, <i>Early Pallava</i>		Tāmraparṇi	4
8, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, 25, 28, 31,		Tandantottam	46
35, 36, 38, 41, 43, 47		Tanjore	5
Śivaskandila	19	Tiastēnes	15
Śivaśri-Śātakarṇi	3, 16	Tinnevelly Dist.	2, 4
Skandanāga	3, 4	Trilocana	12, 13
Skandaśiṣya	9, 13	Trinayana	13
Skandavarman, <i>of the British Museum</i>		Trinetra	12, 13
<i>grant</i> 8, 15, 18, 19, 28, 32, 35, 41		Tūrkaśarman	50
Skandavarman, <i>of the Chendalur grant</i>		<i>Tuḥlika</i>	38, 39
30, 32, 34, 42		Udayacandra	22
Skandavarman I, <i>of the Udayandiram</i>		Udayendiram	22, 30, 31, 32, 33,
<i>grant</i> 29, 30, 32, 34, 44			34, 42, 44, 45, 47
Skandavarman II 29, 30, 32, 34, 44, 45		Ugrasena	13
Skandavarman I, <i>of the Nellore-Guntur</i>		Ujjain Symol	4
<i>grants</i> 24, 27, 32, 45		Ujjayinī	3, 15
Skandavarman I 24, 25, 26, 27,		Uragapura	5, 6
32, 45, 46, 47		Uraiyūr	5, 6
Sopatma	5	Uruvupalli	24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 39,
Soringoi	5		42, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50
Sōrnagos	5, 6, 7	Vākāṭaka	10, 20
Southern Sea	2	Vaidyanath temple	22
Śripārvata	35	<i>Vallabha</i>	47
Śrīśaila	2	<i>Vallabharāja</i>	47, 48
Śrī-prthivī-vallabha	48	Vaijayanti	3
Śrīvallabha	47	Vaiṣṇava	42, 44, 46, 47
Śuddhodana	23	Vājapeya	17, 18, 38, 47
Śuṅga	11, 21	Vajranāga	6
Suprayga	49	Varāha	48
Suranāga	6	Varṣanāga	6
Surāṣṭra	9	Vāsiṣṭhīputra-Cāṁtamūla I	17

	Page		
—Candra-Śāti	...	3	Viṣṇu ...
—Pulumāvi	3, 7, 15, 16, 17		Viṣṇugopa, <i>Pallava prince</i> ... 24, .
—Śivaśrī-Śātakarṇi	...	3	42, 44,
Vasumitra	...	21	Viṣṇugopa, <i>King of Kāñci</i> ... 8,
Vayalur	12, 30, 31, 32, 33, 44		18, 29, 30, 31,
Vellaru	...	5, 6	Viṣṇugopavarman I, <i>Prince</i> ... 24, .
Velurpalaiyam	...	12, 33, 34	27, 42,
Veṅḡi	...	37	Viṣṇugopavarman II, <i>Pallava king</i> .
Veṅgorāṣṭra	...	50, 51	Viṣṇuhāra ...
Vidiśā	...	11	Viṣṇukuṇḍin ... 20, .
Vijaya	...	16	Viṣṇuvarman, <i>Kadamba king</i>
Vilāsaśarman	...	50	Viṣṇuvarman, <i>General</i> ...
Vindhya	...	2	Viśvāvasu ...
Viṇhukaḍa	...	11, 19	Vitastāra ...
Virakoravarman	25, 26, 27, 34, 45		<i>Vyūpṛta</i> ...
Virakūrca I	12, 15, 33, 34		Vyāsa ...
Virakurca	...	34, 45	Western Ghat ...
Virapurisadata	...	17, 18	Western Sea ...
Viravarman	24, 25, 32, 45		Yajñaśarman ...
Viripāra	...	36, 37	Yajña-Śātakarṇi ... 3
Vāsava	...	23	Yajñasri ...
Vasudeva	...	22	Yavana ...
Viṣaya	...	40	Yevur ...
Viṣayapati	...	39	Yuanchwang ...

11870

